



About the Author

Leading Light Commander Prairie Fire has been fighting for revolution since the late 1980s. He has put his life on the line again and again. He worked for or alongside numerous people's organizations around the world. He is currently holds the honor of commander of the Leading Light Communist Organization (LLCO). He has the spirit of the warrior, the poet, and the philosopher. He lives for the people. He has worked tirelessly to see real, true, scientific communism reborn. He has written extensively on philosophy, science, culture, economy, history, current events, revolutionary strategy. His groundbreaking theory of Leading Light Communism has inspired and continues to inspire movements across the globe. He is a teacher, a soldier, a leader.

CASTING PEARLS

CASTING PEARLS

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, ART, REVOLUTION

COMMANDER PRAIRIE FIRE

LEADING LIGHT COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION

Dedicated to "E"

CONTENTS

Preface	1
 The Interviews	
Out of the shadows into the sun	4
Origins	16
“Third Worldism,” epistemology, art, socialism	28
Plato’s cave, First and Third World, science and epistemology	44
Empire, Gender	59
Life	66
 Dialectics Versus Science	
On walking into a propeller	76
More on dialectics, high, and low science	83
More on dialectics: Two against the many	90
Science vs. Dialectics, again	97
 Science and Heroes	
Smashing idols	102
On the inverse cripples	108
A Note on Conspiracy Theory and “Intelligent” Design	115
On counter-revolution: Just pointing to revisionists is not enough	117
It’s still important to oppose book worship	121
Solving the Gordian Knot, instruction on method and decisiveness	123
 End Notes	 124

Preface

"Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine..."

- Matthew 7:6, King James Bible

"We must cast our pearls before the vast majority who know their true worth."

- Leading Light Commander Prairie Fire

This important volume is made up of several parts. The first part is a collection that contains several interviews given over the course of 2014 by one of the most innovative and important revolutionary leaders today, Leading Light Commander Prairie Fire of Leading Light Communist Organization (LLCO), a global revolutionary movement known the world over from Bangladesh to Brazil, Myanmar to Poland, the Philippines to the United States, Mexico to Thailand, Germany to Canada. The interviews cover numerous topics: epistemology, science, aesthetics, literature, economics, strategy, life. The second part contains articles pertaining to the short debate over science and dialectics. The third part contains more articles on philosophy and religion. Prairie Fire is known as a great innovator, someone who is always pushing science forward. These writings represent some of Prairie Fire's most important and creative to date. In these times, when there are so few real revolutionary scientists and leaders, it is important for such a voice to be heard. We wish Leading Light Commander Prairie Fire, along with all Leading Lights, the best. We thank them for all their hard work. They truly are the ones leading humanity out of the darkness. The pearls in this book must be cast far and wide. And we will see who is who. The masses must be armed with the most advanced science so they can really make revolution. All-powerful Leading Light Communism is the future. As Prairie Fire says, "we carry our future on our finger tips."



Part One

The Interviews

Out of the shadows into the sun

December 14, 2014

1. Thank you for agreeing to answer a few questions. We admire your work very much. We admire all the Leading Lights. Leading Light Communist Organization is the only organization that is bringing forward new ideas to make revolution in the real world. It is exciting to finally meet you, Leading Light Commander. I know you have many names, but we'll refer to you as "Prairie Fire." Can you briefly discuss the problem as you see it? What is wrong with the world?

We live in a world of great poverty, great misery, great suffering, great cruelty. The scale of violence inflicted against humanity and the Earth is unprecedented. Global Empire, the Bourgeois World, the First World, is stealing our future and the future of the planet itself. Half the world lives and dies on less than 3 dollars a day. 800 million people do not have access to safe water. For hundreds of millions of people just getting by, just finding safe water, is a life and death, and daily, struggle. Every year, millions of lives are cut short due to structural poverty, lack of healthcare, lack of food or safe water, toxic environments. Endless wars, assassinations, drone strikes, bombings, death squad terror. Suffering and cruelty are everywhere. Our people are destroyed. Our common home, the Earth, is destroyed. If we do not act, then there will be nothing left, no future for our children and their children. We must fight back. Our children deserve better. We deserve better. But we should not strike out in blind rage. If we are to really win, we need more than just a revolutionary body, but also a mind. We must be guided by the Leading Light of truth, by revolutionary science. Without theory, practice is blind. Leading Light Communism is the only way forward.

2. It is hard to think about just how terrible it all is. It makes me want to cry sometimes. So few voices are speaking truth about just how bad it is. I don't want to live in a nightmare. I want a good life. What is your goal? What kind of world do you want?

The last waves of revolution were defeated. We do not need to repeat the past. We do not go forward by cobbling together the fragments of the past. We must understand the past, learn from the past, but we

must go beyond it. The next wave of revolution is made by boldly striking out, casting aside dogma, by putting the most advanced revolutionary science, all-powerful, awesome Leading Light Communism, in command. This means we must break every chain that holds us prisoner. Whether we are bound with one or a hundred chains, we are still chained to the wall. We must break the chains of class, racism, chauvinism, sexism, and every other chain. No one is free until everyone is free. Our war is on the old ways, the Old Power. We declare total war on the First World, on Empire.

We demand nothing less than a whole new world, a world without poverty, without suffering, without cruelty, without war, without hunger, without chauvinism, without rape. We demand a world of equality, a world of peace, a world of justice. Happiness. Joy. Serve the people. Imagine true freedom where we can be our best selves. Imagine a world where we were secure in the knowledge that our children will prosper, that the Earth will bloom again. Imagine all of humanity united in a common purpose, on a great adventure. Imagine if we could start over, to redesign society for the benefit of all, according to the best, revolutionary science. Instead of a society that promotes the worst in humanity, crass consumerism, pettiness, greed, cruelty, imagine a society that cultivated the best in humanity: heroism, courage, bravery, sharing, caring, creativity. Imagine a society that promotes the best of the worker, the farmer, the builder, warrior, the nurturer, the scientist, the poet, the artist and musician, the philosopher. This is our future, our destiny, all-powerful Leading Light Communism.

3. That is a lot to take in. Lots of people know there is something wrong, but they don't know how to change it. Who is on our side in this fight? Where will our forces come from? Who will make revolution? Some people will oppose us, right?

“Who are our enemies? Who are our friends?” The great revolutionary Mao Zedong, who led a mighty revolution that liberated a quarter of the world’s population in China, called this the “first question of revolution.” Unfortunately, Mao’s revolution, like the Bolshevik one before him, was defeated, but there still is so much to learn from those experiences. Even though China and Russia are capitalist now, let’s ask Mao’s question. If we are really to make revolution, we have

to understand who has an interest in preserving the system, the status quo, and who does not. We also have to know which social forces, which classes, which groups, can be aligned, mobilized, against the system. Today, capitalism is a world system, Empire is global. We must apply class analysis not just to our own societies, not just to our communities or neighborhoods, but we must apply it on the global scale. To understand the part, we must understand the whole. To understand the local, we must understand the global. This is today's reality.

In the nineteenth century, when Karl Marx looked at the world around him, European society was entering a new, dynamic era. The scientific and technological revolution was radically transforming life. Peasants were driven from their land, transformed into workers. The beginning of modern production. The factory system was born. Industrialism. Marx saw a polarization happening in society. On the one side were the capitalists, those who owned the means of production, the wealthy, the factory owners replacing the old feudal aristocracies. A new ruling class was replacing the old one. On the other side were those with nothing to lose but their chains. He called this new revolutionary class "the proletariat." Now in his day, the proletariat, the revolutionary class, was made up of the industrial workers who owned nothing, people pushed off the land and transformed into workers who had only their labor to sell. All of society was changing. Capitalism was prone to crisis and instability. The old clan structures, the family, and traditional stabilizing institutions were breaking down. The old rural-based society and its traditions were dying. A new urban, cosmopolitan culture was rising. Marx believed that this struggle between the capitalists and workers, the haves and the have nots, would lead to real revolution, a fundamental reorganization of society according to egalitarian, communist, scientific principles.

This is how Marx saw the world, almost two centuries ago. Our world is much different today. It's not all about Europe, or even mostly about Europe. In fact, the last century of revolution has taught us that revolution will happen in the weakest links of the system, on the edges of global economic power. Lenin's prediction that the storm center of world revolution moving eastward came to pass. Mao spoke of the east wind prevailing over the west wind. Today, the entire world economy is a single entity. Understanding the question of

friends and enemies, Mao's first question requires a class analysis that is truly global. It is not just First World capitalists who are reactionary enemies, but most people in the First World. Ordinary people in the First World have far more to lose than their chains. They have wealth, privileges, houses, cars, electronics, security, leisure, opportunities, mobility. They have access to capital. They have social wealth, infrastructure, land, modern institutions. Ordinary people in the First World do not have a class interest in revolution.

People in the First World are far too comfortable to make revolution. Revolution means risking your possessions and way of life. Revolution means risking death, and the death of family and children. People in the First World, including workers, have far more to lose than their chains. Even the poorest people in the wealthy countries do not make revolution because they are too insignificant, numerically too small and dispersed. And there is enough opportunity and class mobility that they do not feel revolution is the smartest way forward for them. They never form the requisite class consciousness, the revolutionary way of thinking. No matter what we do and say, people in the First World are not a revolutionary social base. No matter how hard we try, they will not make revolution. Facts are stubborn things.

Wealthy people in the Third World who ally with the First World, who are part of Empire, also have a real stake in the system. They are part of the First World, its agents. They stab their homelands in the back. They steal the resources and wealth of the Third World for the First World. They too are our enemies.

Who are our friends then? Who are the real proletariat today? Mao said "serve the people." But, who are our people? Marx wrote that capitalism would create greater and greater misery for the vast majority. People would be pushed and pushed ever down, until they only had one way out, to cast off their chains through revolution. Revolution is the hope of the hopeless. Our real friends are the the vast majority, the ordinary, the working, the farming, the homeless, the small owners, the slum dwellers, the poor peoples in the Third World. These are the people who are being smashed down. These are the suffering masses who have nothing to lose but their chains. Our world is the Proletarian World, the Third World, and its allies. Imagine our people sweeping the whole system away, starting over. Today,

this is the principal contradiction in our world: The global rich versus the global poor, the Bourgeois World versus the Proletarian World, the First World versus the Third World. This is what we must understand to really win.

4. Revolution is what we need, but does it have to be violent. Can't we just vote? What do you think about elections?

There is the story of the man on a ship who has a purse full of gold. He accidentally drops his purse overboard. He dives in after it. He drowns. When his body floats back up. We ask: "Did he own the gold or did the gold own he?"

This is how the reactionary state works. We may pursue change by petitioning the government or by participating in elections. Reform. We may even think we are making progress. Perhaps we even get elected. Perhaps we get some power. But this is the question: "What kind of power are we acquiring?" We are not building revolutionary power, we are instead partaking of the Old Power, the old system, the old society. Even if it looks like we are gaining influence through reform, through parliament, through elections, we are really losing. We are being co-opted. Even though it may seem like we own the system, really, by giving us power and influence, the system is owning us. Like the gold that pulls the man into the water to drown him, the system pulls revolutionaries into reform in order to drown the revolution. Many people never learn. They will stupidly chase after the gold, drowning with a big-fat grin on their face. This is what Lenin pointed out.

Revolution is not a matter of simply taking over the old system and bending it to our will. Rather, revolution is about sweeping away the old society, the Old Power. It is about building a totally new society, a New Power. The revolutionary process is one where two sets of institutions and ideas battle it out. Revolution is a process of constructing a dual power, a New Power, against the Old Power. The old state, the old institutions, the old culture, the old ways of thinking, all are the Old Power. The New Power is made up of new institutions: new ways to resolve conflict, to govern communities, to educate, to build public opinion and shape culture, to defend the people, to coordinate the revolution, etc. The New Power is a whole network of

institutions, a kind of revolutionary shadow state that exists beneath the surface, among the people. The New Power is the people's army, the people's fronts, the people's courts, the people's schools, the people's media, the people's culture, the vast body of revolution. And, leading it all is the Leading Light, the brain that controls the vast body of revolution, the party of a new type. And, when the time is right, the New Power fully emerges as the Old Power is knocked down, filling the vacuum. This is a key part of the revolutionary process.

Lenin taught that the old state is not some neutral ground where the bourgeoisie and proletariat can resolve their differences. Rather, the old state is fundamentally reactionary. It is a tool of reactionary class rule through and through. The idea that we can capture this tool and use it for our own ends is foolish. The old state cannot be a tool of revolution. We cannot reform our way to revolution. Revolution is a deep, fundamental reorganization of all of society, it means disempowering the reactionary classes. It means empowering the revolutionary classes. The reactionary classes will never give us power and turn over their state, their weapon. They will never commit class suicide. Revolution is simply incompatible with the old state, the Old Power. We must write off elections and reformism from the strategic standpoint. "Revolution" means real revolution, warts and all.

Does this mean that we cannot make limited use of the old state, reforms, elections? From a tactical standpoint, it is acceptable to use the tools of the Old Power against itself so long as we understand that elections and reform are very limited tactics, not roads to revolution. For example, in some cases, it is acceptable to participate in an election, not because we believe we can win, but in order to use the election campaign as a way to draw attention to ourselves, as a way to agitate. In some circumstances, it is acceptable to participate in elections as part of an effort to block the rise of feudal, fascistic, militaristic, fundamentalist religious, or dictatorial forces. In other words, if rightist, militarist, fascist forces might win an election, and if these forces promise to wipe out oppositional forces, to silence all dissent, then we should use every tool in the toolbox to oppose them. Because if these fascist forces win, it will make it very difficult to organize the masses for revolution, for Global People's War. If this is the case, although participating in elections will not bring revolution, it can help prevent the rise of deadly forces. There might be other times

when we insert ourselves into local reform campaigns or elections not because it is a path to revolution, but because it is a way to recruit or gain resources. There may be organizational or logistical reasons for tactical manipulation of reformist and electoral campaigns. Think of it this way: Strategically, reform is never a path to power. But, tactically, reform can be an option. "Strategically, never! Tactically, maybe!" We have to always remember that there is only one path to revolution: the Global People's War, the New Power, the Leading Light.

5. That makes a lot of sense. So many groups end up selling out when they begin to work with the system. They always claim to still be fighting for revolution, but the reality is they give up slowly. You mentioned war. What are your feelings on violence and war?

The great Prussian military thinker Carl von Clausewitz famously said "war is politics by other means." Our struggle is a class struggle, the poor against the wealthy. The politics of the poor are absolutely antagonistic to the politics of the wealthy. Our interests are absolutely opposed to each other. Thus there can be no real, lasting reconciliation between us and them. We will not allow them to continue to impose all the horrors of this system upon us. We say "no!" to poverty, to terror, to genocide, to cruelty, to suffering, to toxic and unhealthy environments, to starvation, to rape, to corruption, to the endless indignities we endure. And they will always respond with their own "no!" whenever we reach for power. They will always fight tooth-and-nail for the horrific status quo. They will never give up their power and wealth. War between the poor and the wealthy is the inevitable, normal state of capitalism.

There is a difference though. We agree with Mao when he said we make war to end war. We wage war to end injustice. We wage war to give everyone a prosperous, secure, happy life. We fight to save the Earth, our common home. We fight for our future, for the future of our children. They fight to continue the madness. They fight for a corrupt, stupid, cruel, unjust order. They fight for death. We fight for life. They fight for themselves. We fight for the people.

Is the military struggle our only weapon? Of course not. To emphasize only the military aspect of our revolution, our Global People's War, is a big error. It is an error criticized by Mao during his own people's war.

It is an error sometimes associated with focoism and adventurism. Our struggle is complex. The military struggle of the People's Army of the Leading Light must be integrated with deep political education. The military struggle must be integrated with other aspects of the New Power of the Leading Light: people's committees, people's courts, people's schools, people's culture, etc. This vast network of struggles, both military and nonmilitary, must be coordinated by the Leading Light to achieve victory, total revolution. This means that military struggle, violence, is only one aspect of revolution. The most advanced revolutionary science, Leading Light Communism, is an all-powerful, all-round, awesome strategy. Leading Light Communism is indeed a sword and shield, but much more. It is also the body and mind to wield them. It is only real path to really winning. And it is about winning. To paraphrase Lenin: "Without power, all is illusion."

6. You mentioned the Earth. Past revolutions did not treat the environmental well. Leading Light Communism is something very new though. What about the environment?

Our home, the Earth, is being destroyed. The forests, the lungs of the planet, are being burned. Whole areas, mountain tops, turned to ugly scars. Dead zones in the oceans threaten the entire food chain, including humanity. A continent-sized lake of toxic plastic exists in the Pacific ocean, destroying animal and plant life. Global warming is raising the temperature across the planet, causing water to rise, causing drought and famine, causing natural disasters. Whole countries, like Bangladesh, are threatened with ruin. Imagine the refugee crisis, imagine the death toll, imagine the toll on public health, imagine the harm inflicted on the ecosystem, if Bangladesh were flooded by rising water. Whole island chains may soon disappear. Many people do not realize just how bad the situation is. They dismiss the scientific consensus. Or they simply refuse to acknowledge any problems that do not affect them. Or they only look at their daily lives, not how their actions may affect their children, future generations. Many people do not realize that we are in the middle of another mass extinction. Just as the dinosaurs were wiped out, animal and plant life is going through another mass extinction. It is so bad that if humanity does not wake up, there will be no future left for anyone.

And for what? All of this destruction so the First World can consume more. Capitalism says “buy, buy, buy!” “Consume, consume, consume!” “Waste, waste, waste!” Capitalism is a beast that consumes natural resources and shits out its ugly consumer culture. Not only does it endlessly consume the physical world, but it also consumes beauty itself, replacing it with vulgarity. Capitalism is irrational from the standpoint of human need. It is organized to serve profit, not people nor the Earth. Capitalism cares nothing about the future, nothing about future generations. It is the Third World masses that pay, are starved, so the First World can grow fat. Humanity is walking a razor’s edge. Leading Light Communism, by contrast, calls us to live according to our best selves: help each other, share with each other, sacrifice, be honorable, create, seek truth, and protect nature. Leading Light is about a sustainable, balanced approach to development and nature. We must be guardians of the Earth, of the seas, forests, skies, plants, animals that sustain us all. Serving the people also means serving the Earth.

7. You spoke of the importance of science. There are a lot of attacks on science today. What about religion? Do you oppose religion?

Religion plays many roles in society. It is part of the way those in power and other reactionaries justify their attacks on the masses. All kinds of cruelties are inflicted against the masses by the wealthy and powerful in the name of religion. Yet we must also remember Karl Marx’s famous words from *A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*:

“Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.”

The masses turn to religion because of oppression. They turn to religion as an escape, for comfort. Since this world is so filled with horrors, they seek solace in the thought of an afterlife where things are better. Since justice escapes them in this world, they hope for divine justice, a day of judgement or karma. One of the pleasures of Christian heaven, at least as it is portrayed in literature, is that those in heaven get to watch the suffering of those in hell, those who harmed them in this life. Thus heaven has a sadistic, petty component. Truth

can be hard to handle, so people seek comfort in shadows and illusion. People have always looked to myth. Myth, religion, are also part of cultural and community identity. We must approach this issue in a humble, understanding way. We do not want to trample on identity, culture, tradition as imperialists often do.

Marx famously wrote that the secret of the holy family is the earthly family. In other words, our religious conceptions, our God or gods, are really just mental, cultural constructs. We project social relations that we encounter in our daily life, the father of the patriarchal family, onto the universe. God is a kind of father figure to his children, humanity, his creation. After we project this onto the universe, we then begin to order our lives according to our own creation, but we fail to recognize this projection as our own. It comes to have a kind of cultural life, a kind of perceived objectivity, beyond ourselves. In a sense, religion is a collection of illusions, but also more than mere illusions. Because man is a social animal, as Aristotle famously wrote, because of the collectivity of human life, because of culture, these illusions become a force in the world and in history. But ultimately, religion is false. To continue to be motivated by it, to continue to explain the world by reference to it, is deeply incompatible with science. And since our goal is to liberate humanity and the Earth through empowering the masses with revolutionary science, religion is, in the final analysis, an obstacle to this goal.

The revolution, at the level of leadership, has to be organized according to the most advanced science. And, as Leading Light Communists, our goal is to empower the masses to lead themselves, to give the people the tools they need to understand their world and change it. This means we have to continuously strive to elevate people, to advance them, to educate them, to always try to bring more people into the leadership, to the Leading Light.

What will society look like as we transition to Leading Light Communism? Revolutionary society will be officially secular, but tolerant of the diverse beliefs of many faiths so long as they do not hurt anyone directly. The contradiction between revolutionary-scientific leadership and the religious masses should be treated as non-antagonistic. Those who are religious and try to help the masses should be treated as friends of the revolution. Tolerance and gentle

education should be the order of the day. It is more important to expose those who use God as a way to oppress people than to expose God himself. However, there are some instances when the threat from reactionaries, capitalists, feudalists, fascists with religious ideology is so great that we must suppress them and their fascist beliefs. Those who pervert the best in religion, Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, etc., in order to oppress and exploit the masses should be seen as enemies. To those religious friends of the people, we extend the open hand. To those religious enemies of the people, we raise a clenched fist.

We must all remember that not every individual is at the same place on the learning curve. People have different experiences. We must always be humble. We must always use the mass line. Revolution, leading prisoners out of Plato's cave, out of the world of shadow and illusion, takes time. It is a protracted struggle. It is part of our long march

8. Your message is so important. The future really does hang in the balance. It is frightening, the place we find ourselves as a species. It does lift my spirits to know there are real leadership out there. But are you hopeful about the future?

Revolutionaries are optimists. A great storm is gathering. Crisis after crisis. Poverty. Endless wars. Ecological catastrophe. People have been asleep a long time, since the last wave of revolution was defeated. The people have one eye open. They are beginning to awaken once more. We must open both their eyes with science, with hope, with vision, with a real alternative, one that is based on the truth of past revolutions, but integrates the most advanced science of today, all-powerful, awesome Leading Light Communism. We lead the poor people, the exploited workers, the ordinary farmers, the landless, the slum dwellers and homeless, the small owners, all who truly suffer the worst of this world. They are us. We are them. United in suffering, united in hope, united by our future, shared destiny, the Leading Light.

Those in power will fight us. To the arrogant, we say: "all that you are, all that you represent, all that you honor will be swept away by our mighty storm. From great chaos, the world can be reborn. There is great potential in those who have seen the reality of this system, who

have looked it in the eye, who have endured the worst and survived. And we have endured. We have survived. What does not kill us, makes us stronger. For there is a power in the people that you will never understand, but you will come to know it. We promise you, we will bring it to you, one way or another. You are facing a people, a spirit, you have never seen before.”

Armed with the best, most advanced revolutionary science, all-powerful, awesome Leading Light Communism, we are guiding our friends, the masses, our people into tomorrow. We declare total war on the Old Power, all the poverty, suffering, cruelty, and pain. A New Power of the Leading Light, of peace, prosperity, happiness, justice, heroism, creativity, sharing is rising like the dawn pierces the night. We carry the future on our finger tips. Our future is our own. We will never stop fighting until we win. Fight, fight, fight, until total victory, total liberation, until Leading Light Communism, until we know once and for all that our children have a future, that the Earth will bloom again. This is our great destiny, and we are its walking martyrs. As the Vietnamese poet and revolutionary Ho Chi Minh wrote:

*“Everything changes, the wheel
of the law turns without pause.
After the rain, good weather.”*

The storm will get much worse before it gets better. It will get much darker before the dawn. But it will not last forever. It will get better. This is the time of heroes. Our sun is rising. Our day is coming.

*“All the birds sing at once.
Men and animals rise up reborn.
What could be more natural?
After sorrow comes joy.”*

Origins

May 26, 2014

Recently, we received questions about the origin of Leading Light Communist Organization (LLCO). Usually, we have been secretive about our origins, but we decided to open up a bit on these questions. So, I gave an interview. What is revealed here is a very abbreviated version of our history in North America. This history is not complete out of respect for certain individuals. We would love to write a more inclusive history. This is the history of our North American movement as I remember it:

1. Some people connect Leading Light in North America to the Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM). MIM was a shadowy and secretive organization that is still a mystery to many. When did you first encounter the MIM?

It was probably the early 1990s, long before my experiences in Latin America or my It's Right To Rebel (IRTR) experience. Although I do not consider myself a Maoist now, in the early 1990s I was consolidating my identity as a Maoist. I first picked up MIM's paper, *MIM Notes*, at a local info shop. I began reading both Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM) and MIM literature. What I read interested me. So I wrote to MIM. They began sending me free bundles of *MIM Notes*. I would place them around town. Eventually, MIM requested I prove that I was actually distributing the papers. I wasn't sure what they meant, perhaps I was suppose to take pictures of where I was placing the papers. I did not own a camera. I protested. They were not very friendly. That was that. The paper bundles stopped coming. This was probably my first rocky experience with MIM, something that would be repeated over the years. I continued to read all kinds of revolutionary literature over the years, including MIM's. I never identified as a MIM cadre or as upholding MIM Thought.

2. You have a lot of experience with MIM, more than most. You described your experience as "rocky." What are some of your criticisms of MIM?

Most people who have been around know my view on MIM. I have numerous criticisms, which I don't have time to get into all of them. These criticisms evolved over a long period of time. Here are a few.

First Worldism. MIM's tailing of nationalism, identity politics, their residual First Worldism and First Worldist practice, are the biggest problems.

MIM's security cult. MIM used to mock the Revolutionary Communist Party's (RCP USA) personality cult around Bob Avakian, but MIM had its own "security cult." Security was used by MIM to stifle discussion the same way that RCP did with its personality cult. MIM created a sense that it was always under attack. If a group is under attack, then it is not the time to nitpick or question the leadership. Well, MIM was always under attack. Dealing with MIM always felt like walking on eggshells. This internal culture did not seem very positive to me.

MIM's dogma. MIM's history work is a good example. MIM even praises RCP's hackish book *Mao Makes Five*. MIM and RCP shared the same method of the Stalinists regarding history. The method is not to look at history objectively and then create a narrative. Rather, their method is to create a historical narrative to defend nearly everything Stalin and Mao ever did by cherry-picking data. It was actually my work investigating the Lin Biao affair (we were the first to rehabilitate him, in the IRTR period) that led to my disgust at MIM's shoddy work. I also saw that MIM's defense of dialectics was nothing but dogma. Their political economy was based dogmatically and almost solely on the labor theory of value and the distinction between productive and unproductive labor. When MIM did really get creative, like with their gender work, aspects of their creative developments were very wrong in various obvious and off-putting ways.

MIM's ground game and their rejection of party building. MIM hated RCP so much that they went on and on about how party building was "cult building" when there was no real social base for a strong party. This had all kinds of weird implications. Like MIM seemed to put little effort into recruiting. MIM used to say the principal task was agitation, not party building. I later criticized the traditional MIM line during the early Leading Light days. I would write that "you can agitate more with 100 people than 10 people." I would later claim that even if one

thought the principal task was agitation, organization building will lead to the ability to produce more agitation. Plus, people drop out if you are not constantly recruiting. MIM's anti-party building and anti-recruiting orientation seemed to inevitably lead to it being just Henry Park (MIM3, MC3) by himself and a couple mostly independent projects like the Prison Ministry. Plus, there is another issue. MIM was so eager to strike a blow against RCP, and the cult critique was an easy target, that they failed to see what RCP was doing right. RCP is very good at creating organization in a way MIM never was. If there isn't a social base in the First World, why not build a cult, a gang? If there is no social base, then you need a glue to hold together anything beyond a dozen intellectuals or so. You need to mitigate the reactionary social forces through heavy discipline and loyalty. I pushed the line: "why not build a cult? a business? a gang? a mafia? anything effective to aid the Global People's War?" The MIM and post-MIM folk were still too stuck in intellectualism and First Worldist conceptions of activism to support the implications of such a bold idea. From my perspective, it seemed like they were more into polemical blogging, a little agitation, and very small forays into traditional First Worldist activism. I wanted to develop something more real. This is why I don't really care when the MIM or post-MIM people attack Leading Light as "cultism" or "gangsterism." The implications of what I was saying was too much for many to handle even if they agreed me. It takes a certain kind of daring to follow through on what I was implying. I am not sure, but I think some agreed with me but could not hack it.

Also, there seemed to be a huge lack of "common sense" with MIM. They weren't good at relating to people, lacked charisma. And they did not understand that presentation matters, image matters. They did not understand the importance of leadership in a concrete way, one of the fundamental lessons of Marxist thought,

There is so much to say here. It would take me awhile to develop something like a paper on this stuff. I am also mixing together MIM itself with the post-MIM folk a bit on some of this. In any case, these are the main things that come to mind at the moment. I don't really care to publish some kind of big formal critique of MIM. Why? I don't care. Not really trying to recruit out of their circles. I don't think they attract the kind of people we need as recruits, soldiers. Someone mocked me as "general PF" elsewhere. Exactly. There is a lot of truth

there. Plus, I am not out to wreck whatever the MIM Thought school has going on at this point. I don't see a polemical back and forth as useful because we are not looking to recruit them. Plus, those who need to know already know the differences. Honestly, those remnants of MIM need to abandon their dogma and individualism. They need to drop their ego to dedicate themselves to real revolution. They need to follow the Leading Light, pure and simple.

3. You mentioned another group called "It's Right to Rebel" (IRTR)? Again, this is a history that few people know. It is important to hear the truth about these movements since they did play a role in the past.

IRTR was a think tank, mostly in North America, that was loosely tied to MIM, although there was no organizational link or centralism. I was its founder and chairman, Serve The People its vice-chairman and co-founder. Myself and Serve The People met in a discussion. I proposed we found a new Maoist think tank to hash out ideological issues. I can't speak for the other original leaders, but there was myself, MIM folk, and someone who worked with the Indian Maoists in the original group. Interestingly, the person from India is the one who made the monetary contribution resulting in many of the Beijing Review PDFs floating around the internet. Kind of funny, resources moving from the Third World to the First World in that case. In any case, over time, the leadership became mostly myself, who came from a different trend, but had always read both RIM and MIM stuff, and people who were more exclusively partisans of MIM. The Indian comrade was split off by a police plot, or what we thought was one at the time. Over time, IRTR would come into various strange conflicts with the MIM's chair because of various things, sometimes they were based on political line, or security, or just reflected MIM's "degeneration," increased paranoia. I was at one point accused of being part of some kind of assassination plot. The level of paranoia just got out of hand. I began pushing for distance from MIM. Some agreed, some didn't. Eventually IRTR split, but most of the people formed a secret committee, which was really just the IRTR leadership minus the two biggest MIM partisans. A bunch of new projects were set up and coordinated by this committee. These new projects includes what was at that time the web journal Monkey Smashes Heaven, Proletarian Productions/Shubel Morgan videos, bringing together some offline efforts, etc. I believe this was the first time the term "Maoist-Third Worldist" was used to

refer to the new line we were creating. In terms of articles, it was 90% my work. However, the old IRTR posts were a collective project, myself and Serve the People were the two biggest contributors. I could mention many other comrades who participated a lot in the forums and leadership, but I will let them come forward on their own if they want to. Also, Shubel Morgan did outstanding video work. At this point there was a leadership committee that led several projects. Nick Brown was an independent personality who was a one-man show called Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist Information Network (RAIIN). At that point, RAIIN met us offline in Denver, which is my home town. Certain conditions had to be hashed out before we would work with Nick, who was at that point working with someone we believe to be a police agent who was wrecking efforts to support the Indian Maoists. After Nick agreed to sever his relation with this suspicious individual, Nick was brought into our circles as a leader of the Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist Movement – Denver. The secret committee was still the leadership of the movement as a whole. Then people from my Denver circle and people elsewhere officially formed the first group calling itself “Leading Light Communist Organization” (LLCO). Some in the group wanted to call it “Maoist-Third Worldist Organization,” which I very much opposed. I had also opposed the original term, “Maoism-Third Worldism,” but went along with the majority of the leadership on it since we did not have an alternative at the time. The term “Leading Light Communism” would later be coined by myself, but actually went back to a phrase used by Serve The People who had referred to the great past communist leaders as “Leading Lights.” Serve The People was probably the first in our circles to use the term “Leading Lights,” but the term actually goes back at least to old Soviet literature that referred to Lenin in such terms. I was named chairman of the first LLCO. Think of this as LLCO version 1.0. RAIM was to be its front group, but Nick wasn’t operating under discipline. We were really nice about it though. Gave him a month or so to decide to leave or make a self-criticism and stay, we said we would allow him to retain the name and webpage. It was the most gentle, friendly split in history, considering what we received in return. LLCO 1.0 would retain other RAIM chapters at that point, but eventually RAIM would be phased out and replaced by other fronts. Almost all the original MIM folk and newer leaders were kicked out or left LLCO 1 over the next year or so. Eventually, LLCO bent more and more to my ideas and “the Great Strategic Plan.” Some people left. Some stayed. Many more

joined up. This is really the period of LLCO 2.0, which is really more of a second version of what I had going on in the late-1990s as part of a fully clandestine organization in the southwestern United States and north Mexico that was smashed by the state. The way I see it, which is not the only way, is that Leading Light Communism is more the culmination of my mid-1990s to 2000s work than a growth out of MIM Thought. Although it is undeniable that the dialogue with MIM Thought in the IRTR period very much sharpened and refined Leading Light Communism. Internally, the shift from LLCO 1.0 to LLCO 2.0 was referred to as “the New Turn,” which meant a reevaluation and development of the political line, reevaluation of the tone and style, and reevaluation of tactics and strategy. I could go on and on. For example, there was one split from a Denver IRTR spinoff called RedSol that went focoist and is doing 13 years in prison. The MIM people weren’t even aware of the RedSol incident until much later, but that was a split from the remnants of a politicized “mafia” or “gang,” a tendency within IRTR.

The original IRTR had 2 or 3 main tendencies in the very early days depending on how you look at it. There were the remnants of the leadership of a politicized “gang” that was fully clandestine as a political organization, but not on the streets of Albuquerque, El Paso and Juarez, Santa Fe, and to a lesser and briefer period, Denver. It was not a literal “street gang.” The literal “street gangs” were more like the crews at the lower levels. Certain rackets within certain territory were controlled and defended, until the state stepped in. The state smashed this group, the top leadership got away. On a side note, one of the crew leaders ended up getting a life sentence, but that was for related activities after the organization was smashed. The origin of this organization goes back very loosely to a dissident Senderista group in Mexico, and an attempt to aid them that failed. Then there was a tendency of MIM partisans who were mostly intellectuals, less action oriented. There was a more orthodox Maoist who, if I recall, worked with the main Indian Naxal group but accepted the Third Worldist political economy. She was split off, drifted away. We concluded she was split off by a police plot involving another Indian who was sabotaging solidarity work and slandering the CP India (Maoist). As time went on, the trends never really meshed exactly together. My sense is that although I was the official chair and pushed things forward, the MIM folk always were dragging their heels. To me, they

did not have enough vision or boldness. On the whole, they did not put in much work. They also had not built any infrastructure or recruited anyone offline yet nonetheless they were very represented in the leadership. Ever ask yourselves why Denver has so many of us? Well, we built infrastructure, recruited on the streets. It is my home town. Eventually the official leadership committee of LLCO 1.0 simply became a nominal leadership group since the organization was so lopsidedly based in Denver. More and more the official leadership committee became merely a council of advisers. The real leadership was shifted onto the Denver organization, which was doing most of the heavy lifting. My sense is that the old leadership was not satisfied in this new role and drifted away for the most part. As the MIM folk left, nothing was really effected. On the whole, they did not put in a lot of work. A couple of them wrote a few things here and there. But, I produced 90 percent of the articles, in addition to organizing the ground game with the help of the rest of the Denver leadership. There were exceptions, of course, like Shubel Morgan who was the Minister of Art. A few new outstanding Leading Light leaders emerged, let's call them M, K, and E. If any of these or other people want to be credited in this history, I will add their contributions in. Newer people entered who had little previous connection with either trend. Some went in a MIM Thought direction over time. Others gravitated more toward Leading Light Communism. LLCO 1.0 was a transitional form that still had both tendencies. As time went on, LLCO moved more and more in my direction toward Leading Light Communism. LLCO 2 was born. There is a long history here. This is just a broad outline. And remember, this is just the story of North America, not our international movement.

4. That is a lot of information. There is a lot of ground to cover. Can you give us a time line?

I am terrible with dates, but I consulted with another one of the top leaders from that period. The "gang" period was probably from 1997 to 2002, although there was a short revival of this work in the IRTR period, probably around 2007, but it was in no way sanctioned by IRTR. An effort was made to reconnect with Latin American comrades by traveling to Mexico. It was local IRTR participants who sought to go another direction. Later, there was the focoist deviation that resulted in 13 years of prison for one comrade. IRTR was probably from 2005 to

2008. The secret committee, post-IRTR period was probably from 2008 to 2010. Anticipating the vote to dissolve IRTR, our journal, Monkey Smashes Heaven's webpage was already up a week before IRTR officially dissolved. Comrade Shubel Morgan set up his web page shortly after IRTR dissolved. We encountered Nick, who was going by "RAIIN," sometime in this period. RAIM-D was set up somewhere around this period, later changing its name to "RAIM." LLCO 1.0 was founded in 2010, basically taking the role of the secret committee of the remaining IRTR comrades that led the movement as a whole plus some new Denver comrades and a few others. It was agreed that all of the organizations and projects fell under LLCO 1.0's authority at that point. RAIM-D eventually left and was phased out, but LLCO 1.0 retained RAIM as a whole, which was mostly Seattle and Toronto chapters, maybe one other effort. LLCO 1.0 phased out all of RAIM to avoid confusion with RAIM-D, but also because we thought other fronts would serve us better. In addition, Nick, who had been kicked out, was creating confusion, hurting our reputation. Somewhere in the next year or two, "the New Turn" occurred and there was a leadership shift. LLCO 2.0 emerged. This was maybe between 2011 and 2012.

At this point, we are kind of in a LLCO 3.0 period where most of our work is directed internationally. Eventually, the story of our international work will be told, as will the story of the mid-1990s to early 2000s period.

5. What do you think of the IRTR experience?

I now consider the bending of IRTR to MIM's ideas and whims to have been a big mistake. In the beginning, I was as guilty as the MIM partisans as far as this was concerned. However, I always had serious doubts about the direction. Over time, I was the first of the leadership group to begin pushing for distance from MIM. I consider the experience as a whole valuable in some ways, but the politics of that period were very dogmatic and destructive. At the time, I had a lot to learn though. I had the basic idea of what would become Leading Light Communism as early as the mid-1990s, but this idea was very rough. The IRTR experience and encounter with MIM folk really caused me to sharpen up and deepen my thinking. But I began seeing the very deep flaws in their thinking. And eventually I was able to articulate those flaws from the standpoint of a more advanced science, the emerging

Leading Light Communism. Leading Light Communism can perhaps be seen as the result of a kind of Socratic dialogue between what I was doing in the mid-1990s to early 2000s and MIM Thought, but with the former being the main thing.

6. Lots of this is secret or hidden history because these are clandestine movements. The real revolutionary movement is clandestine. What do you think of flying the red flag openly?

If your conception of activism is First World bound, I don't even see why you need an openly communist party. You might need a cult to organize people effectively, but why a *communist* cult? Just build any old cult and direct people into anti-war, anti-militarism, and other progressive activism. It seems like if your conception of activism remains in the First World, flying a communist flag will only hurt your efforts to be effective at aiding Third World struggles in an objective way. I just don't see the point of the red flag where there is no social base if your conception of activism is traditional stuff. All it will do is undermine your effectiveness. This is why LLCO hid the red flag when we set up various fronts in the First World. MIM expressed this truth sometimes, but they just couldn't follow through because, in the end, it seemed like they were intellectuals who had invested too much in their identity as Maoists. LLCO is openly communist, but that is because we are trying to build stuff in the Third World.

7. What do you think of "better fewer, but better," quality over quantity?

Sure, quality over quantity. We are in agreement there. But what is quality? If you are trying to create a circle of intellectuals to push back against bourgeois ideology, then you will recruit intellectuals, probably from the First World mostly. Quality will mean academic and cultural intelligence, ability to write, uphold the line, etc. If you are into selling papers on college campuses, doing traditional FWist activism, protests, then willingness to do day-in-day-out stuff matters more. Charisma and people skills matter more in the latter than the former, for example. If you have LLCO's "deep politics," then other qualities matter: discipline, loyalty, never snitching, willingness to fight and sacrifice. Having a coward's heart doesn't really matter if all you do is sling papers or blog. We developed different versions of Leading Light

Communism, we call it “high science” and “low science.” There are lots of people who have the lion’s heart, sense of duty, and daringness to think big, but they might not be intellectuals, they don’t care a rat’s ass about the labor theory of value but are willing to die to bring about a better world. Not everyone in Mao’s People’s Liberation Army could read Marx. That doesn’t mean they can’t be organized around a lower version of the science. Think of Plato’s “noble lie” here. Sendero used to say “we carry our lives on our finger tips.” This means, they are willing to sacrifice their lives, money, everything at anytime when called to do so. Well, that is more the kind of quality we are looking for. We’re the real thing.

8. What do you think about inter-imperialist rivalry?

Vladimir Lenin, the great Soviet leader, was correct in his day, inter-imperialist contradictions were growing and this led to a cycle of world wars. Karl Kautsky was wrong then. However, today, the overall trend has been toward globalization and a lessening of these rivalries, even with the very tiny blips on the radar between Russia and the West. There was a time when these contradictions were so great that the world lived on the brink of nuclear annihilation, proxy wars were fought all over the Third World. This was in my lifetime. These small, recent flareups between Russia and the West do not signal some big return to the past, the overall trend has clearly been toward a kind of global system of imperialism. It is kind of like how Lin Biao wrote of how imperialism and social-imperialism still contended, but overall had reached reconciliation in their joint exploitation of the global countryside as a whole. Another person had mentioned Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s work in this discussion. What is good in Hardt and Negri is not unique to them. There are some things they get right, even if their work is First Worldist and also marred in silly, post-modernist jargon. For example, their comments about the expansion and globalization of the non-profit industrial complex as an expanding means of control at the grassroots level, taking some of the role of the old welfare state, is worth mentioning. What is wrong about the Hardt-Negri line is that they see an evening out between the First World and Third World. They are right about globalization, but wrong on this. The Bourgeois World and Proletarian World are still preserved as transnational spheres.

This is one of the reasons LLCO is more internationalist, or, although I hate this term, “pan-Third Worldist.” Others with similar views, MIM Thought (and this includes what is called “Maoism-Third Worldism” now), are more into national liberation, tailing nationalism, pan-nationalism, identity politics, third positionism. This is an important distinction that is not always seen by those looking that these lines. This is one of the big differences between MIM Thought and Leading Light Communism, although there are many others. It also explains our different strategic orientation. MIM Thought, Pantherism 2.0, left Third Positionism still focus on the oppressed nations of the First World, whereas LLCO is about creating organizations in the Third World, initiating Global People’s War. LLCO does not write off resistance in the First World entirely, but the main emphasis has to be on Global People’s War. When First Worldist practice (even with Third Worldist pretenses) begins diverting resources from the main struggle, then it becomes a big problem. Also, globalization is why we see more movements that are not merely nationalist, but trans-nationalist: Islamism (when it does confront imperialism), Bolivarianism, Pan-Africanism. We see less and less localism in anti-imperialist movements because just as imperialism is globalizing, so is resistance to it, albeit at a slower pace. Leading Light is ahead of the curve, which is what a vanguard does.

9. You’ve had an amazing life as a revolutionary. Few really dedicate themselves as you have. You have seen so much. What do you consider the high points of the work over the years?

I consider the high points of the political work to be the mid-1990s to early 2000s period and what is going on right now. I think that we are better positioned than we have been in a long time. Things are golden. The future is bright. The sun is rising. Our day is coming.

10. Do you have anything more to add?

There is so much to say. Really this is just a small portion of a long history. Huge parts were left out, especially the story of our international movement. I have no bitterness toward those who have fallen away. They were all good people for the most part. I just hope they are still fighting the good fight. Do Nothingism is not an option given the horrors of this world. Surrender is never an option. Better to

die on one's feet than live on one's knees. My door is always open to those who willing to really make revolution, those who are really willing to sacrifice, those who "carry their lives on their finger tips."

“Third Worldism,” epistemology, art, socialism

November 15, 2014

1. It is always an honor to speak with you. Many people identify you as a “Third Worldist,” one term that is floating around is “Maoist.” Do you apply these to yourself?

Do we uphold a revolutionary theory and practice that emphasizes the poorest people, those who suffer the most, the exploited and oppressed, in a word, the Third World? Obviously, yes. Probably the most famous line from Karl Marx is when he states, “The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.” If we are honest, we have to admit that people in the First World, generally speaking, have far more to lose than their chains. They have the whole consumerist lifestyle of the First World. They have the comfort of living in prosperous, stable, modern First World societies. If we applied Marx’s criteria honestly, wouldn’t he too be described as a Third Worldist? After all, on the whole, where are the people who have nothing but their labor to sell reside? Where do those who “have nothing to lose but their chains” live? Today, they live, almost exclusively, in what people describe as the Third World. Do we acknowledge the contributions past revolution geniuses? Karl Marx was a Leading Light. Yes. Vladimir Lenin was a Leading Light. Yes. Mao Zedong was a Leading Light. Yes. Just like any real scientist should, we take what is good and toss the bad in all things, including the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist tradition. However, labels can obscure some important things. These labels make it sound as though what we are is just old dogma with a Third Worldist twist. This is not the case at all. What we’re doing is much more profound. What we are doing is unprecedented. Leading Light Communism is far more advanced than anything that has come before. From the standpoint of making revolution, nothing is greater than all-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light Communism.

Let’s put this into context. Here’s a little history. It is funny to think that in April of 1969, Lin Biao, Mao’s greatest general, closest comrade-in-arms, chosen successor, heir apparent announced “revolution is the main trend in the world today” at the Ninth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party. During the Cultural

Revolution, and here I mean the real Cultural Revolution from 1965 to 1969 or 1971 at the latest, the people's war line really held that humanity was so close to worldwide victory that Lin Biao went so far as to say Mao Zedong's theories constituted a new stage of final confrontation between the people's forces and capitalism, Mao Zedong Thought was Marxism for the current epoch, when capitalism was heading for worldwide collapse, and socialism for worldwide victory. Part of this outlook is to see global empire as teetering. Everyone was commanded to push the system over. Thus the will to launch people's war was seen as one of the main ways we distinguish between real Marxism versus revisionism. We agree with Lin Biao on this. There is a widespread phenomenon of First World yappers pimping off people's wars but not lifting a finger to actually help. We call them "cowardly lions." It is a major form of revisionism today. So during the Cultural Revolution, Lin Biao and those supporting people's war were calling for forces in every corner of the world to launch revolutionary wars immediately in order to topple imperialism. This is not unlike Che's call to the tricontinental: "two, three, many Vietnams." The idea is that because imperialism had become so bogged down, so weakened, a mass offensive by people in every corner of the world could topple it. Obviously, things didn't work out this way. And this support for people's war cost the Chinese. The Chinese were openly calling for the overthrow of almost every regime in the world, both East and West. It meant diplomatic isolation. How things have changed today.

Obviously, as things progressed from the 1960s into the 1970s, the Chinese were very wrong about the strength and resilience of empire. Mao and the rightwing of the Chinese Communist Party began to move China into an alignment with the West in the 1970s. Lin Biao, the major voice for the people's war line, was almost certainly murdered in 1971. The Chinese state of the 1970s began to downplay people's war and move more toward traditional diplomacy and reconciliation. It is a bit ironic too since Mao, in part at least, justified his original break with the Soviet revisionists based on his rejection of the revisionist line of "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism. Well, Mao's foreign policy of the 1970s toward the West was not unlike Khrushchev's. Just as the Soviet Union and the West had jointly sold out Latin America, so too the Chinese now jointly worked with the West. Perhaps one of the most famous cases is that China was the first

regime to recognize Pinochet's bloody coup. I recall reading that the Chinese embassy, unlike others, shut its doors to students, workers, and activists seeking sanctuary from the death squads in Chile. Bangladesh is another example. Mao allied with Pakistan and the West, even as Pakistan waged a systematic genocide there. These are some of the blemishes on Mao's record. Now, of course, Mao was one of the greatest revolutionaries, Leading Lights, of all time, but we have to be honest here.

In any case, my point is to say things have changed so much. Things look very different. Today, the revolutionary movement is at an impasse. There are no socialist states. Soviet socialism fell even before the final collapse of the Soviet Union. And China began to slide into capitalism in the 1970s. Today, China is the workforce that produces all the goodies, all the consumer products, for the United States and much of the First World. China's workforce is an exploited proletariat serving First World appetites. So bad are things that not long ago, book after book was published on the "pax Americana," "the global, liberal victory," "the end of history," "the end of the age of the big idea," "the death of communism," and so on.

Our outlook is just not some slightly tweaked Maoism. The problems of the revisionist movement, including Maoism, are much deeper than their political economy. First Worldism, the belief that the First World contains a significant proletariat, that it is revolutionary, is a symptom of a deeper problem. Similarly, continuing to wrap oneself in the vocabulary, icons, and symbols of the past, the Maoist era, the Soviet era, stems from this same problem. Accusations of "tankyism" are traded back and forth between dogmatists. There is a lack of scientific thinking, not just at the peripheries of these movements, but also at the cores. This is reflected in the way they do political economy, yes. But it is also reflected in the way they approach history. This is reflected in their lack of deep cultural analysis, their inability to speak intelligently on art and aesthetics. It is reflected in their blissful ignorance of the incredible advances of the ongoing scientific revolution, discoveries in brain and cognitive science, the green revolution in agriculture, the new discoveries in biology, physics, information technology, and so on.

It is rather funny to me that many dogmatists think that they are so advanced scientifically because they embrace dialectical materialism, yet for them, Lenin was the last word on agitation and propaganda, as though modern marketing, which draws of a large body of psychological research, has nothing to say to revolution. No wonder so many lefty trends are getting beaten by Islam. There is also an impasse in military thinking, which is why the Maoist model isn't working as it once did even though there are a few movements here and there that have run out of steam, stalemated, or on their last leg. None are really winning or even advancing. This all stems from a deeper epistemological issue. It stems from dogmatism. It stems from lack of innovation, lack of genuine science, lack of adaptation. The world changes, so must we if we are to really win. For some people, preservation of dogma is more important than victory. For some people preservation of their orthodox "communist" identity is more important than the people. For us, it is different. We absolutely reject all dogma. Leading Light Communism is all about science.

We cannot stress this enough. Leading Light Communism is not just about political economy. It is about a complete revolution in all areas of revolutionary science. Our knife cuts much deeper than just economics. Leading Light Communism is about putting the revolutionary movement — in all its aspects — on an elevated scientific footing. This is why we say we have one leader: the Leading Light of truth. This is also why we are having discussions about how to craft a proper low science openly. In addition to high science, all revolutions have used low science. We are the first, as far as I am aware, to speak completely openly about the myth making, to invite those who are capable into a broad public discussion of the topic, rather than just constructing the low science behind closed doors. Ironically, we have been accused of being "cultist" for popularizing a discussion that has mostly been kept secret. If anything, we are the ones explaining to the masses how these things work, and asking them to engage in their own liberation in that sphere. Others pretend the problem of motivating and simultaneously elevating a population can be mocked away, or others are ostriches who put their head in the sand. What do they have to show for their approaches? In any case, the new breakthrough of the Leading Light is so profound in its simplicity and depth. We are about really winning, really putting science in command. We are elevating the science at all levels, yet

are doing so in a way that preserves the revolutionary heart of Marxism. We are really talking about creating a new stage of revolutionary science, arming with masses with the best ideological tools available, the best weapons, in order to make revolution, to reach Leading Light Communism.

There is a difference between the First World and Third World here too. Many in the Third World have not yet made contact with the Leading Light. If a man is dying of thirst and all he has is dirty water, he will drink it. However, if given the pure water alongside the dirty, he will choose the pure, unless there is something else in play. In time, the pure water will flow everywhere.

We have already won the ideological battle. It is lonely at the top. Friedrich Nietzsche wrote, you need very long legs to jump from peak to peak. The Bolshevik revolution was a peak. The Maoist revolution was peak. So, here we are, at the beginning of the next wave, at another peak. Most do not have those kinds of legs. Most people are still in the past, in a valley working their way to the next peak. Looking down on the ideological desert, and it is barren. The battle at the level of high science is won. Sure, there are still mopping up operations. Unlike so many of the hypocrites in the revisionist left, we really do put politics in command.

2. *“Politics in command” comes from the Chinese revolution? Can you explain a little about “Politics in command?”*

Yes. Mao famously stated:

“The correctness or otherwise of the ideological and political line decides everything. When the Party’s line is correct, then everything will come its way. If it has no followers, then it can have followers; if it has no guns, then it can have guns; if it has no political power, then it can have political power. If its line is not correct, even what it has it loses.”

Revolution is not just some blind endeavor. it is not an accident. Joseph Stalin once said that the people will row the boat to the shores of communism, with or without leadership. Some believe our victory is

somehow woven into the fabric of nature itself, that our victory is contained in the deterministic motion of atoms, that it is inevitable. This is often associated with productionist and technological-determinist tendencies that ended up serving counter-revolution. Some tendencies saw communism as inevitable, no matter what. They thought that the advance of science and technological progress would simply serve up prosperity without conscious intervention by revolutionary leadership, without conscious, constant, continuous efforts to direct the revolutionizing of power and culture. Historically speaking, these two tendencies fought it out as a battle between counter-revolution and revolution. China's Cultural Revolution is a good example of this fight between communists and the new capitalist class. Revolution is not inevitable, nor is it served up by technology alone. Revolution is something that is achieved by a very specific course of action. Ideology is absolutely necessary. Revolutionary science is necessary. Politics is necessary. Leadership is necessary. Without leadership, without science, without the politics of truth, our boat will row forever in circles. Great leadership of the people armed with all-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light Communism is required for to realize our great destiny. We are a movement of the best of the best, warrior geniuses from every corner of the Earth. Together, we are the sword of destiny on Earth to rid the world of all suffering, exploitation, oppression, poverty, rape.

Specifically, "Politics in command" is a slogan that arises in the army during Lin Biao's "Four First" policy to turn the army into a school of Mao Thought and model for all of society. Those policies were implemented right after the fall of Peng Dehuai around the end of the Great Leap. Remember that Lin Biao was one of the few who rallied to Mao's defense at the Lushan conference when Mao came under criticism for the errors of the Great Leap. Lin Biao had said the problems of the Great Leap resulted from not adhering closely enough to Mao's thoughts. Lin Biao would come to be the main spokesman and embodiment of Maoism during the Cultural Revolution. He was the high priest of the Mao cult while also being depicted as the great warrior: Mao's best student, Mao's closest comrade in arms, China's greatest genius general, Mao's hand-picked successor.

There is a vagueness in the expression, so it was later changed. Think about it. Now, politics is always in a command in a sense. Think of the

person who works harder in order to buy more consumer products. In such a case, politics is indeed in command of his actions, albeit the politics are of a stupid, un-revolutionary variety. Politics is not always revolutionary politics. For this reason, as time went on, when the slogan continued to be popularized as part of the effort to popularize Lin Biao and his army, but the slogan was changed to “Mao Zedong Thought in command!”

Today, communists say “science in command!” or “Leading Light in command!” This means that we must put aside individualism, ego, petty distractions, dogma. Don’t get caught up in petty drama. Don’t let anyone bait us. The yappers will yap. The liars will lie. They literally do not matter. We know who we are. We know our hearts are pure. The great breakthrough has been made, revolutionary science has advanced and continues to do so under the banner of the Leading Light. It doesn’t matter that these ideas happen to be articulated by myself. The point is they are here now. The masses deserve the best. No weapon is more powerful than the Leading Light of truth. Back in It’s Right To Rebel (IRTR) days, the Central Committee declared that the principal task was to spread the high science globally, especially the Third World. Well, that is exactly what Leading Light has done with almost no support from our critics and with inept wrecking campaigns. One wonders how much they have done to advance concrete struggle?

3. You have criticized dogma. Can you elaborate a little? What makes one theory more scientific or better than another? What makes Leading Light better than dialectics, for example?

One metaphysical misconception that many have is that truth is “out there” in some ultimate, spooky sense. According to such a view, the job of science to codify or match itself up with the world itself. On this view, an ideal science would be the one that replicated or reflected so-called “the book of nature” perfectly. On this model, a good theory is one that reflects nature as closely as possible, one that replicates truth in an ultimate sense. This is a view of truth, theory, and science shared by numerous different philosophic traditions, including the dialectics found in the revolutionary tradition. According to this dogma, dialectics is a kind of foundational super science. Particular scientific claims, theories, or disciplines are correct insofar as they are

extensions of dialectics, which purports to correspond to the way the world really is, purports to be a kind of “book of nature.”

Such a view is silly for a couple reasons. Firstly, what an impoverished “book of nature,” a handful of vague descriptions or laws. It should be rather obvious that all the diverse sciences do not reduce to nor depend on dialectics. Physicists, biologists, linguists, hydrologists, chemists, all get along fine without reading Georg Hegel. When you are very ill, you do not usually ask your physician if he understands Hegel’s *Logic* before accepting his medical advice. If you were suffering from a tumor, who would you trust to deal with it, the surgeon who has years of medical school or the literary critic who has mastered Hegel? Those who practice science are able to do their work blissfully ignorant of Hegel. This should tell us that there is something fishy about the self-important claims of dialectics.

Secondly, numerous inaccurate conceptions, about theories, science, language, and truth underlie such a model. Dialectics does not correspond to nature for the simple reason that no theories do. Here, I mean in the “book of nature” sense. Theories, science, are not about matching up a collection of claims with the world. Theories are tools. It does not make sense to ask if a saw is true in some ultimate sense. It does not make sense to ask if a screwdriver matches up more with the “book of nature” than the hammer. Theories are tools to manipulate the world, not get us in touch with the world behind the world. Although Marx did not fully realize this, perhaps he began to move in this direction when with his comment that philosophers have only interpreted the world, but the point is to change it. We do not need to understand truth as correspondence with some objective fact nor as cohering with some super science that does so. Instead, we should understand truth in a more contingent, an intersubjective sense. When we say a particular theory is better than another, we are saying it is a better tool than its competitor. And, science is a set of linguistic and, sometimes, non linguistic tools that are distinguished from other tools, say the creation of poetry or literature, because science is about prediction and explanation. This can even apply to literary criticism.

A science of literature, even revolutionary science of literature, is possible. Probably the best place to jump into this high-level discussion are authors like Aristotle, Northrop Fry, maybe Georg

Lukacs, Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, maybe even Stanley Cavell, Paul de Man, or Julia Kristeva. We should not limit ourselves to what should now be seen as low-level Maoist discussions during the Cultural Revolution. A good dose of modernism, formalism, textualism, New Criticism plus people who have a complex understanding of how cultural objects work in the power struggle, not the cartoonish Maoist polemics criticizing all art for not living up to the clarity of Maoist allegories, which are not unlike medieval morality tales. Although Maoist polemics might be a good start, they are a terrible place to end up. I'm not saying I agree with all these critics on everything. I'm just saying that might be a place to look for understanding literature. There are other tools out there besides science.

In terms of self expression, science may not be as useful as poetry or art. In any case, dialectics is not science for the same reason poetry isn't. Dialectics does not predict nor does it really explain in an informative manner. Then there is Richard Rorty. He was a champion of postmodernism and liberalism. He pushed the idea that discourse was so contingent that there is no point in making any complex moral or political appeals. He once stated he would have been happy with Hegel had Hegel remained with the space of the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, avoiding the more metaphysical drive of the *Logic*. He would have been happier with Hegel had Hegel simply remained an ironist who only claimed to be expressing himself, not out to describe the real world behind the world. Lucky our choice is not simply between postmodern yapperism and metaphysical yapperism, between postmodern liberalism and metaphysical pseudo-revolutionism.

Just as other sciences are tools, so too is revolutionary science, Leading Light Communism. This is why we call Leading Light Communism a weapon that must be placed into the hands of the oppressed. Leading Light Communism is a package of scientific advances in numerous areas. Leading Light Communism predicts and explains social motion today far better than any of its competitors. It better predicts and explains the past, present, and future. It is fine to say Leading Light Communism is about truth, but "truth" understood in a more contingent, although just as compelling manner. This is not unlike how Immanuel Kant understood that our knowledge about the world was mediated by epistemic conditions. Think Kant's forms of intuitions and transcendental categories, or how early Hegel, Marx, or

Nietzsche understood that historical context affected our experience of the world, or Sigmund Freud's view of the unconscious. This is a point about language too. Although there is a lot to be said for what we are discovering about language through brain and cognitive science and through Noam Chomsky's "Cartesian linguistics" respectively. There is also another dimension of language, Ludwig Wittgenstein explored how our view of the world was tied to language games. There is also J. L. Austin, language understood as speech acts, whose determination as unhappy or happy, is very much dependent on wider social expectations and practices. This doesn't degrade truth or claims to truth, it just puts them in a context. Phenomenologically speaking, truth is still experienced as compelling as it ever was, but that doesn't mean it must be taken on its "own" terms so to speak. In this respect, both Edmund Husserl's and Rene Descartes' privileging of special access of the meditating subject to truth and the claims such a subject makes are exactly wrong. Rather, truth is something that only makes sense in reference to ourselves, our communities, goals. Revolutionary science, Leading Light Communism, is about developing tools that predict and explain in order to save the world, to end all oppression, to create a healthy, heroic, fun, flourishing society that exists in harmony with the Earth. All-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light Communism is about forging the ideological weapons for the poor, the workers, the farmers, the intellectuals, the ordinary people so that we can conquer the future that the capitalists have stolen from us. Our future is our own, for our children, for our children's children.

4. You talk about truth being intersubjective, contingent, and so on. Are there times when truths collide?

Of course. This makes for great art. Some of the best art is art that straddles, problematizes, or moves between worlds, so to speak. Ludwig von Beethoven is an example of a person with one foot in the world of the Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and another in the world of Richard Wagner. William Shakespeare too is a kind of collision of our contemporary era with the past. He was very ahead of his times, so to speak.

Sophocles' *Antigone* is a great example. It is a conflict between two worldviews, two moral codes, two societies. On the one side, there is

Antigone, who has to bury her fallen brother's body because it is commanded by the moral law as she experiences it. Such a law is experienced as demanding obedience from Antigone. She is obliged to bury her brother. At the same time, Creon, the ruler of the city and her uncle, declares he not be given the burial rights, that he be left to rot, because her brother had died betraying the city. You have a collision of two moral orders, the morality of the family and clan versus the morality of the city. Sophocles does a wonderful job of portraying the phenomenology of obligation in the character of Antigone. She is so compelled to bury her brother that she faces death herself at the hands of Creon. Similarly, Creon is willing to kill Antigone, his own blood, to protect the city. At the same time, both their actions are portrayed as very much connected to their individual position within a wider community. For Antigone, it is her family or clan. For Creon, it is the city. The text documents a clash of values that must have happened in numerous societies over and over as they transformed from clan and family based to more cosmopolitan, city and state, orders.

Although the idea of the social contract is as least as old as Plato's *Republic*, where it is rejected by Socrates, its rise to prominence at the beginning of capitalism is very much connected to the bourgeoisie. Contracting is part of bourgeois life. The projection of the social contract onto universe, onto history, as a way by which to legitimate, to measure, the status quo is very much part of the ideology of ascending capitalism, the rising bourgeoisie as it battles against other reactionary social classes, especially those of leftover from the feudal era. Today, the bourgeoisie does not bother justifying itself this way. As Vladimir Lenin pointed out, the bourgeoisie is no longer playing a progressive role. Capitalism is now decadent, in decline. The capitalists do not feel the need to justify their order by reference to such complex ideological constructs. Capitalism is just a given, human nature. The capitalist ideology today when compared to the Enlightenment is the difference between the ascending bourgeoisie and decadent bourgeoisie. It is the difference between Beethoven and Beyonce. It is the difference between Rousseau and Cheetos.

On another point, it is a misconception that the high art of the past, the high art of the earlier bourgeoisie, is the main form of capitalist art today. Classical music, for example, is not the music of the capitalism

or even the capitalist overlords. Ordinary pop is the music of capitalism. Classical music is similar to modernist art in this respect. It is not easily understood. It usually requires more education to develop an appreciation for it. It is an art that requires thinking, which is something that is required as the bourgeoisie ascends, as the bourgeoisie challenged the old, traditionalist order. Today, the main form of capitalist culture is an art that requires very little effort by its listeners and viewers. Pop art. Advertising. Capitalism in decline is not about thinking. Heroic reorganization of the social order no longer occupies the bourgeoisie or its culture today. Rather, it is about consuming and not asking why. Thus art that provokes people to think, even if its origin is itself the bourgeoisie of the past, ends up being a kind of resistance against the dominant culture. This is something that Adorno saw, but the point really goes back to Kant in some ways.

At the height of the Cultural Revolution, Maoists criticized art that did not put class struggle and revolutionary themes to the forefront. The Maoist art was very similar to medieval allegories, morality tales with no ambiguity. The good characters were all good, representing the proletarian line. The bad characters were all bad. Maoists openly argued against what they called “middle characters.” Everything was very clear. Even the lighting in Jiang Qing’s model operas reflected this. The hero was fully illuminated, the light source was not directly on the villain, making him shady, literally. Maoist art sought to replace much of the old art that was deemed reactionary. Even though some of the Maoist art was genuinely good, much of it looks cliché because they were trying to fill the cultural void that was left when they got rid of much of the old culture. A few decades of artistic production was trying to fill the void that had been filled by art produced over thousands of years. Also denounced in this period was art for art’s sake, including formalism. It was denounced because it did not overtly represent class struggle. And this was equated with not aiding the class struggle. The Maoist view is incorrect.

The mistake is in thinking that art for art’s sake, formalism, has no class content or that it has reactionary class content. Art for art’s sake, formalism, experimentation often serves the proletariat. Think of it as akin to scientific discovery. Formalist art helps us discover new ways that the proletariat can express itself. It creates new genres that can then be filled with more overt proletarian content. Experiment is what

created all the great genres of art and music. If only capitalist societies engage in such experiment that produces new genre, socialism will look boring, unexciting, a drab world where art is not much different from a political lecture. Do we really want a socialism that lacks all color, that lacks all cultural diversity? A socialism that only can express itself in the most one-dimensional, didactic way will not carry us over to Leading Light Communism. We need a culture that provokes the masses to think, not just absorb. The brains of the masses should not be seen as empty vessels that we pour culture into. Rather, we need a culture that provokes the masses to become actors themselves, and to do this, we need an art that is difficult, that requires thought. We need an art that challenges people to think in new ways. It is a mistake to think formalism is necessarily tied to empty gestures in support of the capitalist status quo. The experience of art should elevate the viewer, or in the case of music, the listener. Thus formalism, art for art's sake, can serve proletarian ends even if its themes are not explicitly political. This is a kind of view sometimes associated with Kant, among others. Maoists may have criticized Confucianism. Although their art portrayed activity on the part of the masses, the didacticism of their style still encouraged that mental passivity in some ways.

In any case, my point is that collisions happen in all kinds of way all the time. Right now, a higher level of revolutionary science has articulated itself. It is called "Leading Light Communism." It is a package of scientific discoveries in all areas of revolutionary science. It is an all-round, all-powerful, awesome, glorious advance over everything that has come before. What we are doing is unprecedented and dangerous, which is why there has been so much push back not only from the capitalists, but also from their useful idiots, the revisionist blockheads, identity politicians, dogmatists.

5. You spoke of a socialism that embraces artistic discovery in the same way it should it should embrace scientific discovery. What other virtues are bound up with Leading Light Communism?

A new take on a very old question. For many philosophers the question of the good city was very much tied to the question of the good man. From Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, and even Marx, the city was reflected in the man and vice versa. Probably the most famous example here is

Plato's *Republic*. But, Marx also sees how capitalism alienates people from their labor, from their world, from themselves. For Marx, overcoming that alienation was part of the revolutionary project. To get things right required changing both the experience of the self and the experience of the broader society.

In *Phaedrus*, Socrates famously uses the allegory to the chariot to describe the tripartite nature of the soul. The chariot is driven by two horses. Then there is the black horse. It represents the crass appetites, material gain. There is the white horse, it represents "thymos," sometimes translated as "spiritedness." This white horse is recognition, victory. Then there is the charioteer, reason or wisdom. Plato uses this metaphor to describe the human soul. Human souls are conflicted, but in each individual a different aspect of the soul wins out. So, in the *Republic*, Plato divided humanity into different types of people: the bronze souls, the silver souls, the gold souls. We don't need to buy into Plato's concept of class or even his particular interpretation of the good city to understand that different values or desires drive different societies. Marxists have long understood that capitalist societies produce certain kinds of souls, a certain sets of values, certain ways of looking at the self and world. Maoists even used to say that not having revolutionary politics was like not having a soul.

Today's liberal capitalism is not only a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, but its whole culture reflects the limited outlook, the dulled ambition, the crass consumerism of the bourgeoisie. It's not even traditionalist fascism of the past. The white horse, the thymos, the ambition, the desire for recognition, that drives warrior classes in earlier societies, has been tamed, channeled into safe directions. A whole host of fantasy lives is provided to occupy one's leisure time. All kinds of identities, sub-cultures, fantasies. Herbert Marcuse, borrowing from Martin Heidegger, talked about the rise of techne weighing down on the individual, turning him into a one-dimensional cog in the modern social machine. Capitalism may be a society of cogs, but in the First World, the cogs are bombarded with entertainment, disco lights, toys, fashion, pop music. They are provided with all kinds fantasies to keep them occupied, substitutes so that thymos is not realized in a way that threatens the system. They can play wizards in a coven. They can act a Civil War general. They can be a rampaging barbarian in a video

game. This taming also affects those who claim to be revolutionaries in the First World. They can even play Bolshevik or Maoist. All kinds of diversionary pseudo-radical politics channel individuals in safe directions: revisionism, lifestylism, anarchism, and identify politics. The quest for truth and artistic creation becomes just part fantasy play and the exchange of the all-mighty dollar. It becomes just another stage provided by capitalist culture where expression can work itself out in a safe manner. In the *Manifesto*, Marx wrote that capitalist exchange undermines all traditional relationships, even religion and the family. Capitalism profanes everything holy. The crass consumerism and banality of the dark horse drives the souls of the First World.

Contrast the crass consumption and banality of the First World to that of socialism. In socialism, Thymos was channeled in a positive direction, was a part of those great social experiments. Men and women were heroic warriors. For example, a big part of the whole Maoist model, at least as conceived by Lin Biao, was to have all of society “learn from the People’s Liberation Army,” to have all of society embody the ethos of the people’s warrior. Duty, heroism, sacrifice, honor, loyalty were portrayed in the revolutionary images. Ordinary men and women as heroes, but also as men and women. Past socialism did not fail to elevate thymos, its failure was to truly elevate science alongside it in a real way. We see this failure in many places. For example, Soviet socialism rejected natural selection, embracing Lysenko’s Lamarckian foolishness. With almost no debate, Maoists rejected sensible environmental and population planning as “Malthusian.” All kinds of mistakes were made when science was pushed aside for dogma with a scientific pretense fueled by thymos. Leading Light Communism is about promoting and elevating thymos, the white horse, but with science truly in command, as charioteer. Humanity will flourish when science is truly in command, and when the individual is allowed a certain amount of freedom, fun, pleasure, but without the unsustainable, consumption of capitalism. The scientist, the philosopher, the warrior, the worker, the farmer, the caregiver, the artist and musician, the dancer must all be allowed to flourish. Only a truly scientific socialism with a rich, experimental culture will be able to elevate people to cross the bridge to Leading Light Communism.

The capitalist soul is shared by most First World activists, even those who consider themselves revolutionary or radical. And, here, identity politics is part of the First Worldist, liberal package. You have a First World activist culture that claims to be anti-capitalist, but stamps out real leadership. Anyone who is capable who sticks up their head is immediately shouted down and called out. These First Worldists share the same liberal revulsion for thymos. Now, granted, the objective conditions for revolution do not exist in the First World. Obviously, we know this. We have explained this again and again. Even so, more progress ought be possible. C. S. Lewis stated, in a very different context:

*“We make men without chests and expect of them virtue...
We laugh at honour and are shocked to find traitors in our
midst. We castrate and bid the geldings be fruitful.”*

Although it would never get to first base, imagine what the revolution of these First World activists would look like. It would be the socialism of dunces and cowards. If somehow it were to succeed, think of the kind of society it would produce: a socialism of dunces without aspiration or real intellect. It would be a socialism that reflected their empty souls. It would lower the bar just as today’s capitalist society does. Real revolution is not made by destroying what is the best in people. It is not made by knocking great people down. It is made by raising people up, including the brightest lights. The goal is not to get rid of leadership, or simply to declare everyone a leader by fiat, but rather to make everyone capable of truly being a leader. The goal is not to get rid of genius, but to acknowledge it, and to produce as many geniuses as possible. Real socialism is about creating a society where the conditions are in place to allow as many people to flourish, to become great, as possible. Theirs is the fake socialism of fools, which despite its rhetoric promotes the same stupefying soul as capitalism. By contrast, ours is a revolution of genius, of heroism, of creativity, of proletarian and military discipline and sacrifice. We are Leading Lights.

Plato's cave, First and Third World, science and epistemology

December 23, 2014

1. Thank you for taking time from your important work. Your interviews are always fantastic, Leading Light Commander. Let me start by asking this: You write a lot about the "First" and "Third World." Can you explain what you mean?

We are not the first to divide up human society into "worlds" or similar entities. When we talk of "worlds," we are using a shorthand. It's a kind of functionalist category that we use to explain human behavior and potential behavior at the global level. It is not unlike how we use the concept of "class" to describe the behavior and potential behavior of human aggregates.

There is the view that informed the outlook around the time of the Bandung Conference in 1955 and after. It is a view that divided the world into the Western imperialists, which was a kind of "First World." Then there was the "Second World" of the socialist camp. Then there was the "Third World" of the colonies, neo-colonies, and poor post-colonies. Later, there is another outlook of the Chinese Communist Party of the Lin Biao era. This outlook divided the world into a "global city," which was made up of the rich countries and Russia, and a "global countryside," of the poor countries, including the many of the Russian colonies in Eastern Europe. This was the official outlook of the Chinese Communist Party from about 1965 to 1970. This was when Lin Biao was riding high as Mao Zedong's successor, vice-Chairman, "closest comrade-in-arms," "best student," and so on. Lin Biao was being positioned as the high priest the Mao cult. He, and I am using "he" as a shorthand to really mean "his team," was to be the main interpreter of Maoism. For various reasons, Lin Biao was murdered as a result of a political struggle. Mao wanted to pull back the revolution in the 1970s. Mao began to align with the West. So, then, there is the outlook of Mao's "Three Worlds Theory" of the 1970s, after Lin Biao's death. This was a view that divided countries up by military strength. The "First World" was made up of the powerful imperialists, the United States and Soviet Union. The "Second World" was made up of lesser powers like the European powers and Japan. The "Third World"

was made up of the colonies, neo-colonies, and post-colonies. Sometimes people mistakenly think Mao's main error was his "Three Worlds Theory" because it led to the alliance with the West. This really mistakes things. "Three Worlds Theory" was not guiding Chinese policy. China was shifting rightward in foreign policy years before the theory was introduced. Mao began shifting rightward on this issue even as early as 1968 and 1969, as he was ending the Cultural Revolution. Rather, the theory was a prop. This theory was a kind of window dressing that was used to give the appearance of justification to Mao's anti-Soviet, pro-Western geopolitics. It was used to run interference on critics from the left. In any case, all these kinds of views are often mixed up with each other, but they are very different. They have very different policies associated with them. And, historically, they were often in opposition to each other.

Our concept of the "First World" and "Third World" is different than all previous usages. Of the previous views, Lin Biao's is the most accurate, but it still has deficiencies. Firstly, we do not simply apply the concept to just countries. It is because of traditional colonization and the national liberation struggles that many have tended to regard single countries as the basic units of analysis. We see this as not always accurate or the best way to go about things. Some have criticized such a view on the basis that the country borders are artificial. Such borders were often drawn by the imperialists themselves. Some micronationalists have advocated that single nations, not multinational countries, ought be the basic unit of analysis. For example, they will say that the "Black Nation" inside the borders of the country of the United States belongs to a particular world. Or they will say the Maya in Mexico belong to a particular world. Almost all countries today are multi-national ones, so they push the analysis down a level. They tend to think that revolution should happen on a micronational basis, with each nation having its own leadership, perhaps even its own ideology. Their view of a perfect world is one in which all micronations are independent, do not step on each others' toes, and do not interfere with each other. It is the view associated with racial separatists movements. David Duke, the ex-Klan leader-turned-congressman, has such a view. Some Black and Chicano nationalists have similar views. They may disagree about how the borders are to be drawn or which nation has the right to exist here or there, but the ideologies are similar in their stated goals. It is a view

also associated with the fantasy of northern Korean life, although, in reality, northern Korea is very dependent on other countries despite its Juche rhetoric of independence and self-sufficiency. It is a view sometimes associated with Third Positionism and “left” fascism. We could call this view “pan-nationalism.” Our view is very different. It does not break humanity down into either countries or micronations. Our view is more in-line with the original Marxist aspiration to overcome artificial barriers dividing humanity. Our ideal is one humanity united by one ideology, revolutionary science, all-powerful, awesome Leading Light Communism. Tactically, we may have to work on a micronational or country-wide basis, but we should always aspire to make revolution in the biggest geographic area as possible at any given time. Thus for us, our basic unit is the Third World as a whole, although we divide that into zones on a practical basis. However, a zone is not based on anything except that it is the biggest area we feel comfortable managing at a particular time. Thus a zone is not as static as a country or nation is. A zone is based more on our capabilities than anything else, although, naturally, social geographies play into it that. Our main area of operation is the Bangla Zone, but when we feel comfortable expanding beyond that, there is no reason to extend our reach into say, Myanmar or the Hindi regions of India. We are also setting up zonal operations elsewhere, but that is deep politics.

Secondly, we base our view on standard of living of a population as a whole. Things like income, consumption levels, etc. give us a good idea about this. In this sense, even though the United States as a whole may be militarily and politically more powerful than, say, Switzerland, the latter is more First World. This is a big difference between our concept and Mao’s, for example. Also, our concept is not necessarily tied to economic or political independence or development, whatever that means. For example, imagine a country whose population is very wealthy, but also very small so that its economy was only based on oil such that it could not defend itself without outside help. So, it was still dependent in important respects. On our view, such a country, perhaps not unlike some Arab Gulf states, is still First World. Thus our view departs a bit from the Bandung inspired view, which tended to lump the one-time colonies, even the wealthy ones, into the same category as their poorer neighbors. Our view is that the Saudis are more similar in terms of interest to the people of the United States than either are to the Palestinians. This is true, even though pan-

Arabists will argue that the Saudis and Palestinians are really one nation. This is what we have discussed earlier about how national liberation and similar outlooks were tied to the classic model of colonization that has long since broken down. Thus, we must find new ways to understand the emerging Empire and resistance to it. This is one of the main breakthroughs of today's revolutionary science, Leading Light Communism.

Thirdly, the traditional concepts of worlds were sharply defined. We do not look at things through the lenses of traditional Aristotelian categories. This also ties into another question. People always ask us about the "Second World." Our view is that when we talk about the First World and Third World, we are talking about poles on a continuum. Think of a spectrum, a single axis from right to left, with a "1" on the left and a "3" on the right. Some countries, micronations, regions, geographic areas, zone are more First World than others. They fall closer to the "1." Others are more Third World. They fall closer to the "3." If one must have a concept of a Second World, then it could occupy a position, perhaps equidistant, between to two poles.

We might represent the United States by a "U" and place it nearer to the "1" than Portugal, which we represent with a "P." Or, we might represent Switzerland with an "S," and place it closer to the "1" than the United States. Similarly, we could do the same thing with "C" for Chile, "M" for Mexico, and "B" for Bangladesh.

[1]-S-U-----P--"2"--C-----M-----B-[3]

This model can also be used to compare any unit. It is not limited to countries. Countries can be compared to nations to regions to zones, all can be compared to each other. The model is based on the simple idea of immiseration, those geographic populations closer to the "3" have more potential in terms of being mobilized against the system for revolutionary, socialist, Leading Light Communist change. Those closer to the "1" and farthest from the "3" have less possibility of making revolution. Of course, we aren't saying that being near "3" is the only factor in play or that other factors like strong leadership can't make up for some deficiencies in objective considerations. However, at a certain point, objective deficiencies simply cannot be realistically overcome. That's part of what falling on the First World part of the

continuum implies. We could even add that certain regions of this continuum are more prone to traditional fascism, which we see as a radical reorganization of society along traditionalist or crackpot lines to save capitalism. For example, those societies closest to the “1” probably are going to be stably integrated into the liberal Empire. Those somewhere between the “1” and “2,” but closer to “2,” like Russia, for example, will have a tendency toward fascism because they aren’t as well served by the liberal consensus as those closer to the “1.” Over time, Russia will probably be more integrated into Empire, but this is not written in stone. This model fits with the old saying that “liberalism is the face of capitalism when it is not afraid, fascism when it is afraid.” Remember what Karl Marx said: “The proletariat has nothing to lose but their chains.” This is also why we have focused our efforts toward the “3.”

2. You are definitely breaking new scientific ground. You mention science often. You’ve written a lot on the topic lately. Why is your theory of worlds more scientific than others?

This kind of theory is one of behavior and potential behavior of human aggregates at the global level. Sometimes we call it “Global Class Analysis.” This is why we use the terms “First World” and “Bourgeois World” interchangeably, similarly with “Third World” and “Proletarian World.” If people want, replace the “1” in the chart with a “B.” Change the “3” with a “P.” What makes one theory better than another? More scientific? As I have said so many times, it has nothing to do with metaphysics, even in its dialectical varieties. It isn’t some “dialectical method” or “dialectical underpinning” that makes one theory better than another. It has to do with a theory being a good tool with predictive power and explanatory power. These are not the same things exactly, although there are sophisticated approaches to try to reduce these two things down to one measure, but this is far too advanced for this interview. Imagine another graph with a horizontal axis labeled “PP” for “predictive power” and a vertical axis labeled “EP” for “explanatory power.” For this discussion, we’ll say they are not the same thing. The classic example of why they are not the same can be seen in the competition between the Copernican model, the heliocentric model, planets going around the sun, of the solar system verses the pre-Copernican model, the geocentric model, celestial bodies going around the Earth, with its epicycles. The epicycle model

had been refined over a long period of time, so it mapped out the motions of the solar system very well. It had a higher degree of predictive power. In fact, when the Copernican model was originally introduced, the pre-Copernican model had more predictive power than the Copernican model. This was because the Copernican model had not been refined as much. The Copernican model was initially using circular, not elliptical orbits. So, it was generating more false predictions. So, strictly speaking, there would be no basis to switch paradigms to the Copernican model if predictive power was our only measure for a theory. However, as we all know, the Copernican model of planets going around the sun won out. This is what we use today. This is because science is not just about prediction, it is about meaningful prediction, it is about explanation too. Science is also about explanatory power. The pre-Copernican approach, the epicycle model, may have mapped the motions of the heavenly bodies more accurately, but there was no rhyme or reason to their motions. Their motions were simply mapped. And, if there was some new motion that was observed that had not been known before, they simply posited an ad hoc epicycle to account for it. So, even though the pre-Copernican model generated more correct predictions, it had no real explanatory power. One reason it evolved as it did was it cohered with the medieval intellectual view inherited from Aristotle. According to this view, the cosmos was like an onion with the Earth being the center. That was said to be why objects fell when dropped. They were said to go toward the center, where they naturally belonged. Cohering with this broader view was seen to have some explanatory power. However, in reality, cohering with a false, but widely accepted worldview, does not add to a theory's power. To choose it over the Copernican model violates one of the main laws of explanatory power, Occam's Razor. Simpler theories, those that say more with less, account for more with less, generate more correct predictions and exclude more incorrect predictions with less, are better than complicated ones. Even with its initial predictive weakness *vis-a-vis* the earlier model, the scientific community realized that the Copernican model had more potential. And the Copernican model was eventually refined to have both more explanatory and predictive power. When a theory has both more predictive and more explanatory power than another, saying it is "more scientific" is always more justified. However, there are hard cases. A theory can have more predictive power, but less explanatory power than another. A theory

can have more explanatory, but less predictive than another. Say we have two theories. One has the coordinates of 6 on the PP-axis and 7 on the EP-axis. The other has a 7,6 position. Or a conflict between a 5,6 and a 4,8? There are many times when there simply is not enough information to choose between theories. They are too close in terms of overall virtue. When theories are too close to each other, the scientific community simply has to continue its work gathering information, testing, weighing evidence until one theory comes out on top. This happens all the time in science. A new, but not as refined, theory comes onto the scene, but it takes time for it to gather enough strength and refinement to shift the paradigm of the scientific community. In reality, things are a lot more complicated than what I have presented here. Nonetheless, even understanding this basic outlook would be an epistemological advance for those revisionists claiming to be Marxists today. There are other, higher, more advanced models all-powerful, awesome Leading Light Communism has developed, but we need to take things step by step.

In any case, our Global Class Analysis predicts and explains why revolutions have occurred where they do. It explains why certain populations will be more revolutionary than others. It predicts which populations will have potential to make revolution and which ones do not. Our analysis fits with everything we know about the experience of real revolutions and events like the non-revolution in Paris, May 1968. People went back to work for raises, despite the rhetoric. The Paris, 1968 ending was entirely predictable. Our analysis also predicts and explains the motions of the enemy classes that we see everyday in the media's coverage of current events. We explain the sweep of history in a more accurate and refined way, drawing on Marx and others, obviously. All-powerful, awesome Leading Light Communism is the key to the past, present, and future.

3. You were talking about worlds, zones, and so on. You seem to be introducing a geographic dimension to class. Can you elaborate?

“Who are our enemies? Who are our friends?” are the first eight words of Mao's Selected Works for a reason. Mao called this the “first question of revolution.” Class analysis, understanding friends and enemies, is the first task. Since Marx, the our understand of friends and enemies has become more and more geographic. What I mean is

that friends are enemies are not just separated by wealth and social position, the proletariat has become more and more physically separated from the bourgeoisie. By the time of the Maoist revolution, revolution itself is seen as a people's war that proceeded geographically from the countryside to the city. Similarly with Lin Biao, the global revolution moves geographically from the global countryside to the global city. This is because human geography is reorganized around modern production and wealth. Within a country, wealthy people live here, poor people live there. Globally, wealthy people live here, here, and here. Poor people live there, there, and there. You can see this very dramatically in some of the cities in countries like Brazil. You might have an outpost of the First World, a wealthy residential community, a business district, etc. walled off from the outside, which is still very Third World. It's like a little First World fort from which to dominate and control the surrounding territory. You see this in Palestine with the Zionist settlers. They set up their guarded outposts, where they have a higher standard of living, while hostile Palestinians surround them. It reminds me a bit of pioneer communities in North America. One sees a similar pattern in wealthy communities in China. In any case, even when there is close proximity of the First and Third World, the barrier separating them is often very pronounced. In these cases, it is a physical wall where guards patrol with automatic weapons. How should we see these wealthy communities in, for example, Brazil or China? Should we see such a community as simply a community of the Brazilian bourgeoisie who can be either patriotic or comprador? Such is the old Maoist type analysis. My contention is that this may be part of the story, but it isn't the full story. Capital is more and more global, nation matters less and less, country matters less and less. Rather than seeing those who populate such communities as just the Brazilian bourgeoisie, we can see them and the communities themselves as outposts of the First World, part of the First World Empire. An extreme case of this would be the Green Zone in Iraq, where the Empire has literally built a city with a higher standard of living inside a Third World, occupied community in order to control and manage them. The nationalist, patriotic bourgeoisie is becoming less and less relevant. More and more, the world is not a collection of many empires with colonial possessions. Rather, power is mostly a single Empire that benefits, this First World includes populations of the old empires, but also First World outpost communities, military bases, management zones,

financial zones, etc. in poorer countries. These communities, regardless of their national or racial makeup, are loyal to their First World way of life, and the global imperial institutions that create it, first. They are part of the First World system of control first and foremost, usually nationalist loyalties, if they exist at all, are very secondary. This is partially a consequence of a more unipolar geopolitics. The patriotic bourgeoisie is becoming less and less relevant because the wealthy people in the poor countries have less ability to maneuver, they have less bargaining chips when there is only one imperial choice.

There are exceptions of course. Things are never set in stone. This is an emerging picture, the overall tendency is toward Empire. There are still remnants of the old world that Vladimir Lenin described. Some think an emerging Eurasian alternative, a Russia-China alliance, will block the emergence of global Empire for a time. Thus, they think, the traditional categories will still have scientific utility. Sometimes people frame it in terms of Kautsky verses Lenin, but this is way too simple. Lenin was exactly correct when he was writing. The scramble for Africa, the cycle of world wars, and so on. And it would be a mistake to see the emerging Empire as anything Kautsky could have foreseen. It would be wrong to project current reality backwards. In fact, it was, in part, the tremendous damage done to capitalist by the breakdown of the system, the world wars that Lenin predicted, that has forced the bourgeoisie to reorganize. The Bolshevik revolution was partially a result of the systemic breakdown of World War 1. Similarly, the Maoist revolution and decolonial struggles emerged because the old empires had so weakened themselves through their massive bloodletting. They could no longer hold onto their colonial possessions since they were so weakened. Partially as a result of world wars, the capitalists lost control of massive parts of humanity, they faced the emergence of socialism that challenged their rule at the global level. Just as revolutionary science – Marx, Lenin, Mao, Leading Light – advanced to meet new realities, so too did the science of oppression. The capitalists have reorganized their economies and power to try to avoid catastrophic wars of the past. The most obvious artefacts of this advance in capitalist science is the promotion of social democracy and international institutions like the United Nations. In any case, it boggles the mind that you have these revisionist dogmatists talking about 2014 as though it were 1917 or 1949, as though adherence to

Leninist or Maoist dogma is the solution to the current problems the people's movement faces. Of course, I understand that the opposite problem exists where there are loudmouths and egomaniacs promoting themselves as worldclass leaders but without really providing any real scientific answers. There are plenty of snakeoil salesmen claiming to have their own unique "new synthesis." They are a dime a dozen. There is a big difference between proclaiming a scientific advance and really making one. And contrary to popular misconception, the loudmouths are not all white. However, just because there are fools in new clothing telling us to follow them does not mean we should follow the fools in outdated fashions and vice versa. Luckily, our choice is not simply one between old fools and new fools, old dogma and new dogma. There is a real choice, a real road to the future, but it is not always easy to find or walk.

Anyone who honestly looks at all-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light Communism cannot in good faith say that we have not done our work. I have done exactly what I promised I would many years ago when we first began. We have done exactly what we said we would do. It boggles the mind that some Maoists extended support to us when we were just talking about things, as soon as we really did it, they withdrew their support. Sometimes I want to point at our work and say "here it is on a silver platter, we have carried out the principal tasks as you defined them without any support from you. Where is your support now that we have been proven right? Who was it who used to talk about parlour pinks?" In any case, Leading Light Communism is a genuine scientific advance over the Marxist-Leninist and Maoist traditions. I have done exactly what I have always done. We really are integrating the most advanced science in every area of human knowledge into an all-powerful weapon that can be wielded by the masses. There are plenty of opportunists and careerists who will continue to mock us. There are some who do not like me personally who have let their personal dislike of myself or other leaders transform themselves into liars, wreckers, virtual and real state agents. There are some who have become jealous, bitter, little wannabes and second-rate gossip mongers. Others become ostriches who cowardly bury their head in the sand to avoid seeing the sunlight of truth. Others have produced attacks, very similar to those of COINTELPRO in the United States, except more pathetic and inept. They are big into gossip directed at Leading Lights. In general, we have

more to worry about: State agents have tried to disrupt our logistical networks domestically inside Bangladesh. It is an old story. Many will try to raise themselves up by tearing down great leaders, Leading Lights. There are plenty of people on the wrong side of history. Talking to them is like talking to a brick wall. We have a saying: "let the yappers yap." Yes, we have advanced science. When have we ever walked away from the challenge of proving it? If you want a good laugh, go and ask one of these dogmatists why they think their dogma is more scientific, then compare and contrast with our discussions.

There is always going to be more false paths than the one true path. In class society, there will always be more liars than speakers of truth. It takes time. It's a protracted struggle, as Mao taught. We have to have proletarian attitude about all of this. No quick victories. We have to be long marchers, day in, day out. In a mere few years, under very bad conditions, with little money, we have established a new global revolutionary movement. This is just based on the pure science, on the idea. Imagine how it's going to take off once we solve more organizational and logistical issues. We are just getting started. This is an exciting time to be alive. We are writing history as others write plays.

4. Those who are awake, the serious people, congratulate you on all you have accomplished. It is astonishing when you think about it. Some are always going to bring it back to one issue: You are rejecting Marx's categories for your own. Are you?

There is always a doubting Thomas. And if I am moving beyond Karl Marx, so what? Marx should be seen as a scientist, not as a religious figure. Even Marx said "I am not a Marxist" on his deathbed. Most of those who claim to be Marxists today should not be seen as real Marxists. Rather, they are people who worship Marx, or Lenin, or Mao as one would worship God or a saint. No leader or writer is infallible. People are not perfect. Real Marxism is one and one thing only: the best science applied to the task of reaching the communist ideal, ending all systematic oppression. Science evolves. The best science is a science that is always evolving, advancing, becoming more powerful, able to solve more problems. Now contrast this with how dogmatists regard Marxism, Leninism, or Maoism. Their ideology is a metaphysics.

It is stagnant, frozen. No innovation. Now, contrast their work to all-powerful Leading Light Communism.

Some people confuse innovation with revisionism. If all innovation were revisionist, Lenin would be a revisionist who ruined Marxism. Mao would be a revisionist who deviated from Marxism and Leninism. Even late Marx would be a revisionist who deviated from early Marx. This is a completely incorrect understanding of revisionism. Revisionism is not just about changing or updating Marxism. It is about revising the revolutionary heart out of the science. Revisionism can come in many forms. It does not always present itself as an innovation. It can also present itself as preservation of the orthodoxy. When it comes down to it, revisionism is really just about deviating from the science, which means deviating from Leading Light Communism. Updating, advancing, is necessary for a science to survive, to stay relevant, to not ossify into dead, frozen metaphysics.

This reworking of basic categories is not exactly new. The Maoists were some of the biggest critics of revisionism. Yet Mao himself offered a new theory of class in his analysis of China. By the time of the Cultural Revolution, or the last years of Mao's life, Maoists began to introduce the concept of the "new bourgeoisie." This became applied to people like Deng Xiaoping or Liu Shaoqi by later-day Maoists. Did Liu Shaoqi or Deng Xiaoping own the means of production in the same way a traditional capitalist does? Could Deng Xiaoping sell a shoe factory to anyone he wanted? Could he give it away of his wife as a wedding present? Could he turn any factory in China into his personal swimming pool? Of course not. There were some similarities between the higher levels of the Chinese bureaucracy and the traditional capitalists, but also some differences. Hence the adjective "new" was used in describing this new bourgeoisie. The point here is that the Maoists had begun to separate class from the point of production in the strict sense found in Marx. They began to have a more complex view of class to match shifting realities. Similarly, in the United States, there is a situation where the old categories do not fit. A person in the United States might earn a wage in one job, yet might have an online-trading business to make extra money. They might also technically own the means of production through the ownership of stocks or through their retirement plan. On top of that, they partake of all kinds of public

institutions that feed off of exploitation in the Third World. Some of these institutions they have some limited control over through the democratic process. Others they benefit from, but have less control over. At the same time, these ordinary people in the First World share the bourgeois way of life. Even if they do not own capital, they have access to it if they chose to liquefy their assets or take out loans. Just as the Maoists implied that the ownership of China's productive capacity by the reactionary bureaucracy is collective, a similar process can be seen to have happened with ordinary people in the First World. They have complex relationships to production and distribution, but that relationship to production is less and less important. They partake of the benefits of being in the First World, the role of exploiter has been collectivized across whole strata and across whole geographic regions. It doesn't really matter if they earn a wage or not. What is key is that they siphon off value unjustly from others or from the system as a whole. Whether that value ends up in their pockets through a wage or salary, in their pockets from a benefit payment, or a flow from a private sale, or if it ends up in an institution that they have a say in running or are benefiting from, or if they get a benefit by simply living in a geographic area, is not the main thing. The main thing is that they are exploiting others, what superficial form the value transfer takes is not as important. There are all kinds of ways exploitation happens, that value gets shifted around. And much of it is hidden from us. Just as it may not be immediately apparent how a man like Deng Xiaoping who earns a salary can be a part of the bourgeoisie, it may not be immediately apparent how a US worker can be. However, it is very important to look beneath surfaces. Just as Marx exposed a reality obscured by commodity fetishism, it is important to expose the reality obscured by dogma and privilege. Updating the science is fine, introducing new categories or changing old ones is fine so long as the new categories are better tools in terms of making revolution, as long as they have more predictive and explanatory power. Those who read *Leading Light* closely will know that *Global Class Analysis* not only updates our understanding of the First World, but also the Third World. *Leading Light Communism* also pioneers the theory of the New Proletariat and understanding the revolutionary demographics of the slums of Third World megacities. Again, this is a departure from the tradition that feels it is necessary to link class to the point of production. "But Marx said" is not a compelling argument against reality.

Today, when the people's movement is at such an impasse, it is the time for great leaders to come forward with real, true scientific advances, with Leading Light Communism. This is also why Leading Light Communism has been more well received in the Third World. The real proletariat in the Third World faces obliteration at the hands of empire. The impasse of the people's movement has real consequences for them. Their sons and daughters are dying. Their land is poisoned. Finding a way out of the stagnation matters. Science matters. To put science back in the forefront of the people's movement is to take back the future from those who have stolen it from us. This is why we say "our future is our own." Now that the scientific breakthrough has been made, armed with the all-powerful sword of Leading Light Communism, nothing can stop us. Destiny is ours.

5. You said you were breaking things down in a simpler way in this interview so that you could be understood. Do you mean to say that what you are proposing here is a simplification? Because it is all very challenging.

I'm simplifying things a lot here. We've introduced the conception of high and low science in my writings. There are different audiences for different ideas and presentations. Different people need to hear different things depending on where they are in the learning curve. Some people are more advanced than others. Some people are even more advanced. Some lights illuminate. Some blind. There is high and low science. Then, there is really really high science, science that is part of our deepest politics. It's just not helpful to expose people to it at this point. People are not ready yet. Plus, it could expose the organization to attack. When people are ready, we'll introduce higher levels when their eyes adjust a bit to the current light being shined in their faces, when they are ready.

Someone recently described Leading Light as "Search and Rescue Team, Plato's Cave." This is very funny because she was not the first person to guess the other name of our organization. The allegory of the cave in *The Republic* is probably the most famous scene in all of philosophy. Socrates describes a scene where people are strange prisoners in a cave, chained to a wall. Because of the position of the light source, the prisoners only see themselves and objects as

reflections on the cave walls. They mistake shadows for reality. All their lives they are mistaken. Imagine how difficult it would be trying to explain the outside world to one of the prisoners. Mao talks about the frog stuck in well. He looks up and mistakes the small patch of sky for the world. Imagine trying to educate someone who had somehow survived in a well their whole life about all the wonders of the world. Socrates points out that if one of those prisoners who had grown up his whole life in the cave suddenly was exposed to the outside world and sunlight, it would hurt his eyes, perhaps even blinding him until he adjusted. He would not immediately understand what was going on around him. Pain was the experience of Neo when he first woke up in *the Matrix* movie. All the world is a cave, illusions created by mind and class society. And leaving this cave can be blinding. This is how it is with truth, with real science, all-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light Communism. Some prisoners are still all the way in the deepest pit of the cave. Others are fumbling their way out. Some sit on the edge of darkness and light, like the Buddha of myth, refusing to embark to paradise before rescuing everyone else. Maoists used to say, "you cannot break every chain but one" In other words, all chains have to be broken to achieve true freedom. Similarly, Leading Light states that "nobody is free until we all are." Socrates said those trying to rescue the prisoners would even risk their own death because of the ignorance of the prisoners themselves. And, Socrates did eventually meet that fate at the hands of the Athenian state. As Leading Lights, we, pledge everything in this great cause, even our lives.

Empire, Gender

December 23, 2014

1. In your writings, we find the idea of a First World empire. How does this fit with the recent developments in Syria and Ukraine?

Thank you.

There are a few things here. Firstly, it is important to look at the historical sweep, the big trends, not to get caught up what happens to be in front of us at any given time. Yes, there is a small flare up of what used to be called “inter-imperialist conflict” between the West and Russia. Syria and the Ukraine are the most visible examples, although there are some other smaller examples usually bordering Russia. Here I am thinking of South Ossetia and Transnistria. However, we have to have a sense of proportion. Even in my life time, inter-imperialist rivalry was so great that the world lived on the brink of nuclear holocaust. Conflicts between the West and the Soviet Union existed across the globe. In almost every Third World country, there were Western proxies fighting Soviet proxies. In Latin America alone, civil wars raged in many, perhaps most, countries at one time or another. When I was growing up, it was El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Guatemala that were in the headlines, but there were also countries like Granada, Colombia, and on and on. And this was just Latin America in the mid-1980s to late 1990s. This pattern was repeated across the Third World, and even in parts of eastern Europe. Look at the struggles between the West and Soviet Union over Indochina, the Middle East, or Africa. If you go back further, prior to the World Wars, then the inter-imperialist rivalry is even bigger in some ways. Just look at the scramble for Africa. All of Africa was divided up by the European powers. Inter-imperialist rivalry was so great that it led to a cycle of world wars, as Lenin predicted. The recent disputes between Russia and the West pale in comparison. The overall historical sweep is away from the kind of rivalry that existed in the past.

Secondly, it is not exactly accurate to say that inter-imperialist rivalry does not exist at all; rather, it is mitigated by other factors and

interests. In the past, communists listed several kinds of contradictions that existed in the world. They listed the contradiction between the imperialist powers, the contradiction between imperialism and oppressed nations, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The main way to interpret events and conflicts was through these lenses. Of the various kinds of contradictions, Maoists used to say the principal contradiction was between imperialism and oppressed nations. This meant, among other things, that this lens was more important than others in interpreting the world, understanding events, designing strategy. This outlook gave precedence to national liberation movements. This wasn't to say that other contradictions did not exist, but they were pushed to a subordinate position. Although Maoists were usually good about identifying the principal contradiction, they were never good at saying which contradiction was second, which was third, etc., in importance. In any case, just because we say that a First World empire has emerged does not mean that inter-imperialist contradiction is non-existent. Obviously, there is a conflict between the West and Russia, albeit minor in the grand scheme of things. The growth of transnational capital checks what remains of national capital in the traditional imperial countries. The interests of the transnational capitalist class can override the interests of national capitalists that might remain in the imperialist countries. A lot of factors play into this: mutual reliance – such as the relation between the United States and Chinese economies, transnational institutions, governing bodies, treaties, NGO networks, policy think tanks, etc. All blunt the strength of the interests of national capitalists.

This also applies to pockets of the First World that may exist surrounded by the Third World. Patriotic bourgeois elements in a country like Brazil may still pursue their interests, but because of their standard of living, their quality of life, and how that is dependent on the broader First World Empire, their actions must also be understood as mitigated by the contradiction between the First World and Third World. In other words, the patriotic bourgeoisie still pushes for its interests, but only up to a certain point. Think of it this way: You might have a patriotic bourgeoisie that genuinely wants to develop their country industrially, might want to pursue a more independent foreign policy or whatever. This patriotic bourgeoisie might still come into conflict with the more traditionally comprador pole of the national bourgeoisie, who, let's say, make their money based on being the

middleman for a particular foreign power. So, there is a contradiction between the patriotic capitalist and the comprador capitalist. Or there is a contradiction between compradors who are connected to different imperialist powers. There have been numerous wars in the previous era between these different sections of the bourgeoisie in many, many countries. Today, these kinds of wars are less likely because the capitalist system has become much more stable. These kinds of conflicts between interests are often constrained by the limits set down by the First World Empire, often constrained by their interests as part of the First World itself. We can say that the principal contradiction is between the First World and Third World. Other contradictions still exist, like the contradiction between the old imperialist powers, like the contradiction between poles or segments of the nation bourgeoisie in poorer countries, but they are relegated to a subordinate position.

Thirdly, this has implications for those trying to make revolution. In the old days, a force seeking to make revolution could play one imperialist against another, one comprador against another, or play the patriotic bourgeoisie against the imperialists and the comprador bourgeoisie. Revolutionaries had a greater ability to seek material aid from competing forces. Revolutionaries were sometimes even able to lead a class alliance that included segments of the colonial bourgeoisie against the imperialists. For example, the Chinese revolution is one that mobilized segments of the Chinese bourgeoisie under Communist leadership against the Japanese imperialists. Because of the development of the First World and Empire, and the stability of the global capitalist system, capitalists all over the world have less room to maneuver against each other. They themselves may have various interests as capitalists, but they also may have interests as First Worldists. This means it is unlikely we will witness another world war. We cannot count on material aid from competing capitalists. There will be less and less opportunity for united front politics. We will have to walk on our own two feet.

2. You have also written extensively about gender. How do you see patriarchy today in countries like the United States?

People have to understand that not all females share the same conditions under patriarchy. The poor females in the Third World

endure terrible conditions. They endure the horrors of both class and gender oppression, and other forms of oppression too. A female in the Third World may endure terrible exploitation of her labor in a Third World factory, yet she may also have to accept a position as subordinate to other males, including male workers, because of feudal traditionalism. She may have to make herself sexually available to the factory owner or to other males because of patriarchy. She may have severe restrictions on her sexual behavior. She may have little choice in marriage or divorce. Perhaps, against her will, she is married off to an old man she does not know. Perhaps she is part of a traditional caste that is obliged to turn over their children, including their daughters, to other castes. Or she is expected to labor in the home and at the factory, working far more than her husband. Or she is abused and controlled by her husband's in-laws, forced to work for them all. These and many other kinds of oppression are a reality for millions and millions of females across the Third World. Capitalism, imperialism, often works with traditionalist or feudal patriarchy, to ensure control and obedience from women, to get more work, more labor, or to pay lower wages. Sometimes Maoists have identified this as a kind of semi-feudalism that affects women. These women are a core part of the proletariat. They are a core part of our revolutionary social base. They endure so much pain and suffering. They have nothing to lose but their chains.

We have to ask ourselves this: Who benefits from the oppression of these females in the Third World? Who benefits from the control of their bodies and labor? The answer is that the entire Empire benefits, both First World males and females benefit. This is what revisionists refuse to face. Just as laborers in the First World benefiting from imperialism become enemies of revolution, so too do females in the First World benefiting from imperialism and patriarchy inflicted against the Third World. As such, First World females are generally enemies of the liberation of Third World females.

This has created a very interesting situation in the United States. Traditional patriarchy has broken down in many ways. Traditionalism no longer governs relationships between men and women as it once did. Imperialism has created a situation where so much value flows to the First World from the Third World that US society can afford to extend social-democratic privileges to their entire populations,

including women. Freedoms once reserved mainly for males are now granted to females. Opportunities once reserved mainly for males are granted to females. Like their male counterparts, females in the United States earn superwages, have First World lifestyles, comfort and security. Females in the United States are no longer forced to be “barefoot and pregnant in the kitchen.” All of this is based on the exploitation of the Third World, the exploitation of Third World males and Third World females. There are some exceptions, like the lives of females in the Gulf Arab states, but on the whole, First World peoples, both males and females, have more and more life opportunities afforded to them. At the same time, Third World peoples, both males and females, have their life opportunities restricted. Just as it is a lie that First World workers and Third World workers share a common class interest, it is a lie that First World females and Third World females share a common gender interest. The advances of First Worldist feminism comes at the expense of both males and females in the Third World. Imperialism works with the worst forms of patriarchy, including feudal ones, to enslave Third World women and children to the benefit of First World populations, including First World women and children. The idea of a universal sisterhood of both First World and Third World females is a myth.

Even though traditionalism between men and women has broken down, which is a good thing, it has been replaced by new kinds of unhealthy relationships. Many personal relationships are terrible here. There is a greedy, self-centered culture where loyalty, care, love, and duty mean very little. Karl Marx pointed out the hypocrisy of the bourgeois who criticizes as having no sexual morality, when capitalism itself has systematically turned relationships into a kind of generalized prostitution. Friedrich Engels stated very clearly that marriage under capitalism was really just a kind of prostitution. This observation is not new. Immanuel Kant wrote about how marriage is about mutual access to each other’s property and bodies, which may sound crude but is nonetheless an advance over how women were treated under feudal patriarchy. At least under the kind of liberal order Kant represents, women are granted the agency and rights to have some degree of power over their bodies. Marx stated that under capitalism, all that is holy is profaned. This is true for even the closest, most intimate relationships. I am reminded of Madonna’s hit from the 1980s, “Material Girl.” But it cuts both ways, there are plenty of

“Material guys” too. The pimp and hoe are idolized by a society of abusive dunces. The United States is a world of douche bags, assholes, hoes and bitches. A certain kind of patriarchal traditionalism has broken down to be replaced by a spectacle of new, liberal forms of mutual abuse. Of course this does not apply to every single person, but it is fairly pervasive. You have a lot of First Worldist revisionists that are spoon-fed their politics on sexuality and gender by liberals. They think it is somehow revolutionary to weigh into this muck on the side of First Worldist feminism. Thus they make themselves useful dupes in a struggle between imperial populations, between liberalism and traditionalism, or between one kind of liberalism and another kind of liberalism. Their alliance with First Worldist liberal intelligentsia, the left wing of the Democratic Party, on these issues ends up discrediting these revisionists to the very poorer communities in the First World they claim to represent. The revisionists end up looking like a bunch of whiners and weenies, losing all respect among ordinary people, including ordinary women. It is a comedy of errors that is entertaining to watch. You get epic struggles over which pronouns to use with transgendered people, or the proper terms for this-or-that sexual identity, or out-of-touch polemics over the use of the term “faggot” or “bitch.” Yet there are few who have the courage to really look at the system in a real way, as Marx and Engels did. People are too intimidated by the liberal consensus. Lifestylism, identity politics, liberalism of various forms passes itself off as Marxism and revolutionary feminism. The reality is that this whole emphasis, this whole type of politics, is one that exists because of and promotes imperialism. By contrast, Leading Lights are real communists, proletarian feminists. Our feminism is one that begins with the truly exploited and oppressed masses of the Third World. Our people are the those truly oppressed by global patriarchy in the Third World, not those who happen to be women, but nonetheless benefit from Empire. Our concern is with the oppressed, not the oppressor.

3. You write about rejecting traditionalism and liberalism with proletarian feminism. Can you elaborate?

We reject the black flag of fascist and feudal traditionalism. We also reject the rainbow flag of liberal Empire. Imperialism is still imperialism be it black or pink. We advocate proletarian feminism, proletarianism. Past revolutions pioneered this way of living, although

they did not go far enough. If you look at the Soviet Union or Maoist China in their revolutionary moments, they sought to move beyond traditional gender restrictions, traditional gender expectations, etc. They put a good deal of effort into debunking traditionalism. At the same time, they did not fall into the liberal free-for-all of use and abuse that exists today. Women were portrayed as capable industrial workers, capable warriors, capable leaders. Women and men were portrayed as strong, as intelligent, as heroic. But women were also portrayed as beautiful, as healthy, as women, also, as mothers. The unity between proletarian men and women was emphasized, the common bond, common interest, common destiny. It is important to break down artificial barriers that traditionalism erects, but not fall into the liberal free-for-all. We need to grant freedom and opportunity, but within the context of keeping strong communal bonds. We need to expand opportunity as a means of advancing men and women in their common proletarian destiny to reach Leading Light Communism.

4. We don't have much time left. I'll set this up quick. Some people say that biology is a social construct. They say not only gender, but also biological sex is made up. What do you think?

Men and women obviously have important biological differences. Evolution has designed us differently in some respects. Some of the most obvious differences are the sex organs, but surely there are psychological or neurological differences too. Some liberals will point out that there are cases of people who fall between male and female, perhaps having ambiguous sex organs. They then say "ah! ha! Male and female do not exist! Binaries are make believe!" This is ridiculous. Sexual dimorphism exists not just in humans, but in most, almost all, complex species. Just because there are some anomalies, just because a minority is ambiguous, does not mean a male/female spectrum does not exist.

We need to promote healthy and liberating conceptions of gender that also strengthen our people and advance us toward our common destiny. However, we should not put a dunce cap on our head and pretend that our biology is exactly the same when it is not. We need an intelligent approach to gender, one that is informed not just by the history of oppression, but also by the realities of biology.

Life

December 29, 2014

1. People might disagree with you, but everyone acknowledges you are an important writer and leader in the revolutionary movement. Even your biggest ideological enemies within the movement seem to have a deep respect for your work. People say “he’s totally wrong, but he is a genius.” I don’t know if you are aware, but you provoke that kind of reaction. Is there anyone in the broader left or revolutionary movement that provokes a similar reaction in you?

I assume you are asking about living authors. Noam Chomsky is someone that I have that reaction too. Chomsky is a genius who revolutionized linguistics. He totally changed the study of syntax. His approach had a big impact, it had all kinds of implications for cognitive science, philosophy of mind, philosophy of science, etc. He was a great scientist, and he also took up “far-left” politics. He produced numerous works criticizing imperialist foreign policy, works that stand the test of time and are still useful. Unfortunately, he thinks of himself as an anarchist. Even though he is very wrong in his understanding of class, the revolutionary process, and the history of revolution, it is undeniable that he is brilliant, that he revolutionized linguistics, and that he is an astute critic of both the media and imperialism.

2. Some would say you cannot really consider yourself a linguist unless you are familiar with Chomsky’s work. Similar things could be said of your work too. You can’t be a revolutionary unless you study Leading Light’s work. Does the enormity of your job weigh on you?

Yes, very much. For whatever reason, the stars aligned to put me in this position where the world is on my, and our, shoulders. It is very hard, very overwhelming. It consumes my life. I have very little for myself because I am responsible for so much, all my energy goes to the people, the future that is to be. I do not want to let humanity down. I will not betray the Earth. I want to be able to say to our children that “I did my best, my duty.” The life of a Leading Light is one of sacrifice and little reward. It is a life of danger, attacked from all directions. It is pain. Yet we soldier on. The Maoist leader in Peru, Presidente Gonzalo, used to say “we are condemned to lead.” This is

exactly right. The lesser souls who yap and snipe are only jealous because they are not capable nor commanded to lead. They imagine it to be very different than it is. And in the beginning, right now; this is a time when the whole world stands against us. Truth versus the world. The martyr, poet, revolutionary Bobby Sands wrote:

*“There’s an inner thing in every man,
Do you know this thing my friend?
It has withstood the blows of a million years,
And will do so to the end.*

*It was born when time did not exist,
And it grew up out of life,
It cut down evil’s strangling vines,
Like a slashing searing knife.*

*It lit fires when fires were not,
And burnt the mind of man,
Tempering leandened hearts to steel,
From the time that time began.*

*It wept by the waters of Babylon,
And when all men were a loss,
It screeched in writhing agony,
And it hung bleeding from the Cross.*

*It died in Rome by lion and sword,
And in defiant cruel array,
When the deathly word was ‘Spartacus’
Along the Appian Way.*

*It marched with Wat the Tyler’s poor,
And frightened lord and king,
And it was emblazoned in their deathly stare,
As e’er a living thing.*

*It smiled in holy innocence,
Before conquistadors of old,
So meek and tame and unaware,
Of the deathly power of gold.*

*It burst forth through pitiful Paris streets,
And stormed the old Bastille,
And marched upon the serpent's head,
And crushed it 'neath its heel.*

*It died in blood on Buffalo Plains,
And starved by moons of rain,
Its heart was buried at Wounded Knee,
But it will come to rise again.*

*It screamed aloud by Kerry lakes,
As it was knelt upon the ground,
And it died in great defiance,
As they coldly shot it down.*

*It is found in every light of hope,
It knows no bounds nor space
It has risen in red and black and white,
It is there in every race.*

*It lies in the hearts of heroes dead,
It screams in tyrants' eyes,
It has reached the peak of mountains high,
It comes searing 'cross the skies.*

*It lights the dark of this prison cell,
It thunders forth its might,
It is 'the undauntable thought', my friend,
The thought that says 'I'm right!'"*

We are long marchers. We have strategic confidence in the proletariat. I do this because I am obliged by duty, honor, truth, love; not because of non-existent accolades. It is not a wise career choice, but it is the right thing to do. If there was someone better, a better leader, I would happily stand aside. Truth matters. Duty matters. Honesty matters. Loyalty matters.

3. Amazing poem. Bobby Sands was the Irish prisoner who led the hunger strike to the death for political status. He died for what he believed. When you are right, you are right. Do you have to fight the system? I mean, can you turn off revolution?

I believe in right and wrong. I believe in truth. I believe in beauty. Duty compels. As Immanuel Kant pointed out, we experience what is right as a command that we feel we must obey. Not unlike how Sophocles' protagonist Antigone experiences her obligation to give funeral rites to her brother as so compelling that she risks life and punishment to fulfill her obligation. She eventually commits suicide. It is no accident that Muhammad is also called "the slave of Allah," and "Islam" means submission. Honor compels. Love demands. Truth commands. Such is being the vanguard, a Leading Light. We submit to truth and duty. We are the hand of truth, of the right. Serve the people is a moral command. There is no further explanation. It was Ludwig Wittgenstein who said explanations come to an end somewhere. There is no question, we must fight. We must lead.

4. Have you ever been in combat?

Yes, but maybe not as people imagine. I know how to handle a gun. I have been to the hills, but nothing very significant. I have dead comrades, brothers and sisters who fell in combat in Latin America and Asia. I have imprisoned friends. Grant Barnes, my roommate, went down for, I believe, 13 years, in the United States. Prison sucks. He was accused of a string of bombings. He was accused of being part of Earth Liberation Front, which wasn't true in any organized sense. He identified as a communist when he was arrested. I was picked up on an unrelated bomb making investigation years before, but got arrested on other charges. I used to sleep with a Bulgarian AK and a Kel Tech 9mm. I have been wounded and shot at several times in connection with the movement. I once had a knife at my throat, even thrown out of a car. I have had guns on me numerous times. We had one of our cars fire bombed once. I have also answered others in kind. I have seen a lot of violence close up in Latin America and in the United States. It is not something I dwell on. You become numb to fear after awhile. We do what we must. As Mao said, we wage war to end war.

5. What kind of music do you enjoy?

I enjoy all kinds of music. I enjoy classical music. Beethoven comes to mind, especially his *Ninth Symphony*. The “Ode to Joy” is wonderful. Like the symphony itself, Schiller’s poem represents a transition between the cosmopolitan Enlightenment and the Romantic period. It speaks of the commonality of all men, humanity, brotherhood. This kind of universalism represents the bourgeois order as it ascends. The bourgeoisie must project its condition as universal to convince itself and others of its right to rule. It must characterize its aspirations and class interests as those of all men. The bourgeoisie legitimizes its rule this way. Yet at the same time, it is not reason or interest that unites men in Schiller’s poem, but rather, the experience of joy. Thus the poem also has a foot in the era of capitalism in the decline, where art sees itself as disconnected from such political ends. A simple emotion is hardly a basis for a political order. This sublime piece links both the political destiny of the age with the aspirations and innocence of the individual detached from politics, the grand sweeps combined with the child’s tune.

During the Chinese revolution, revolutionaries instructed people to “make the old serve the new,” or make old art serve the revolutionary order. The most famous revolutionary song of China, “The East is Red,” was originally a peasant love song reworked with new lyrics to become the theme of the Cultural Revolution. When the Chinese launched their first satellite, it broadcast this tune back to Earth. Anyways, Beethoven’s *Ninth* is a piece that has been made to serve both revolution, but also reaction. It has been appropriated by revolutionaries, by fascists, and by liberals. When it was performed in the socialist countries with its emphasis on human promise, brotherhood, and solidarity, it easily fit with revolutionary goals. Nazis too preformed it, thinking it a towering piece of German culture that represented German brotherhood. Liberals too appropriated it. It was played as the Berlin Wall fell. To the liberals, it represented liberalism, cosmopolitanism, and European unity. It is interesting how one piece of music can be so open to different appropriations. We should remember too that the “Internationale” was influenced by “La Marseillaise.” Although it was denounced during the Cultural Revolution, Franz Schubert’s “Unfinished Symphony” is one of my favorites. Its melancholia reflects the shortcomings of modern life, and

the modern soul. For this it was denounced as petty-bourgeois and reactionary, if I recall. "Night in Tunisia," with its chaotic, moody reflection of modern, urban existence resonates with me. Although the latter Jazz classic is far more chaotic and urban, less romantic than Schubert, obviously. "Haitian Fight Song" by Charles Mingus is also a great song that reflects the militarism of the oppressed.

I also enjoy lyrical music that speaks to or expresses something important about society or the human condition. Telling the story of the oppressed is often more effective than didactic sloganeering. Woody Guthrie's "Airline to Heaven" is a great song that expresses the misplaced hope put in religion by the downtrodden and desperate. "Eleanor Rigby" by The Beatles is a good one. Songs like "Jane Says" by Jane's Addiction or "Changes" by 2Pac, which is based on a Bruce Hornsby song, tell stories of those who suffer in one way or another. Joy Division. Nina Simone's "I wish I Knew What It Means to be Free." I also enjoy Mexican corridos, one's that tell the story of martyrs. Judith Reyes. Jose Molina. Irish Rebel Music. John Lennon's "Imagine" is an amazing song about communism. "Bittersweet Symphony" by The Verve was a shared favorite of myself and someone I once cared for deeply. It points to the pointless existence endured under capitalism:

*"Cause it's a bittersweet symphony, this life
Try to make ends meet
You're a slave to money then you die"*

"King of Pain," "Synchronicity II," "Don't Stand So Close to Me," and "Message in a Bottle" by The Police are all great. A song that really interests me is The Police's "Wrapped Around Your Finger." It may seem like a superficial love song at first, but it is more than just that. The song is an expression of the master-slave dialectic in Hegel. The song is about someone who is in love with another person so that they lose themselves through their infatuation and obsession. The song is sung in the voice of the slave, in the voice of he who is submitting to another:

*"You consider me the young apprentice
Caught between the Scylla and Charibdes.
Hypnotized by you if I should linger
Staring at the ring around your finger."*

*I have only come here seeking knowledge,
Things they would not teach me of in college.
I can see the destiny you sold
turned into a shining band of gold."*

He puts himself in the position of the slave, of submission, of being controlled by the his desire for recognition from the other:

*"I'll be wrapped around your finger. I'll be wrapped around
your finger."*

For the person in the slave's position, identity and knowledge flow from the master and the relationship with the master; from the dominant person in the relationship. However, a funny thing happens. The master in this dialectic, presumably a woman in the song, comes to define herself as master, as dominant through the needy slave. Thus the master needs the slave's desire in order to form her own identity. Thus the script gets flipped by the end:

*"Devil and the deep blue sea behind me
Vanish in the air you'll never find me.
I will turn your face to alabaster,
Then you'll find your servant is your master,*

And you'll be wrapped around my finger."

By the end of the song, they are co-dependents, both in need of recognition through the other. I find it very clever, but I am sure the deeper significance is lost on many.

I really enjoy so-called "Electronic Dance Music" or "EDM," house music, techno, in all its many forms. In some ways it is like symphonic music. The emphasis on sounds rather than lyrics; such music pre-linguistically taps into emotions. There is so much here. I went to my first warehouse party in 1992. I remember Bjork, techno, Orbital, Opus III, the Orb, Prodigy, Aphex Twin, Gus Gus, Underworld, Chicago house, French house, Daft Punk, trance, Chicane, Tiesto, Ministry of Sound, chillstep, Odesza, Blackmill, deep house. There is just too much to list. It reminds me of happy times. Stardust, a Daftpunk spin-off,

one-hit wonder, put it well: “Oh baby, the music sounds better with you.”

6. How do you see yourself, as a fighter, a writer, an activist?

I see myself as a thinker, a teacher, a writer, a scientist, a philosopher. I also see myself as a warrior, a fighter. Duty, courage, and honor are very important to me. I am also a leader. Someone who has been placed in a particular situation by historical circumstance. Sometimes I feel like a victim of a cosmic joke: cursed like Cassandra, blessed to see the future, but condemned so that nobody believes her when she warns others of their demise. Writing symphonies for the deaf. It is part of being at the front of the learning curve, the vanguard. It is lonely at the top. Or, Plato’s philosopher who returns to the cave, who risks death and humiliation in his efforts to save the prisoners. Or, the Buddha who returns to the world, who does not enter paradise until everyone else has. We are compelled by truth and duty to serve the people. It is the fate of any great revolutionary, philosopher, prophet, or sage, who has discovered a great, but hidden, truth. We live and work among Plato’s strange prisoners or Mao’s frog in the well who mistakes the small patch of sky for the universe. People do not recognize the many chains that bind them. Those that see the chains cannot break them alone, so we require the help of the prisoners themselves. It’s like that old saying that the liberation of the workers must happen through themselves. It is a difficult task, to try to get people to take the red pill, to see truth. Some people prefer shadows and illusions. Truth hurts at first, but in the end, it is worth it: beauty, virtue, courage, wisdom, creativity, love. Such is my, our, great destiny.

7. If you found yourself victorious, in the middle of future society, with no obligations, no duties, no responsibilities, what would you do?

I would dedicate myself to family, to my future wife, to love, to making love. I am an athlete, I love to run. I love nature. I grew up near the mountains. Emma Goldman said something about the importance of dance. There is some debate about what exactly she said, something like:

“If I Can’t Dance, I Don’t Want To Be Part of Your Revolution”

I like the sentiment. I would explore the world of the mind, writing, science, philosophy, poetry. Perhaps I would even make music, or dedicate myself to farming. I would like to explore life with my family, the woman I love. Karl Marx envisioned communism in a very similar way, a world where we can be our best selves, where we aren’t pressed into any one thing. My mind always returns to family though. Family means a lot to me.

8. What do you say to those who dismiss your work because it differs on some points from Marx, Lenin, and Mao?

That’s easy. Dogmatists do not interest me:

“Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine...”

There are plenty of dunces out there. They are not my audience. We must not waste our precious time. We must cast our pearls before the vast majority who know their true worth. Humanity longs for truth. Humanity longs for pure water to quench its thirst. There is only one real ideology truly of the people, of revolution: the pearl of revolutionary science. And, it would not be science if it remained stagnant. All-powerful Leading Light Communism is the future.

9. Is there anything you want to add?

There is always more to say, the conversation is never over. We’re from very different places, very different backgrounds, experiences, but we are on this long march together. Keep your head up. Stay strong. From great suffering, from great sacrifice, there will be great beauty, truth. Our day will come.



Part Two

Dialectics Versus Science

On walking into a propeller

May 11, 2014

The following are quotations from a discussion by Leading Light Commander Prairie Fire.

1. What are the origins of dialectics?

If you understand where dialectics comes from, then it should be apparent why it is nonsense. It comes out of the misguided, post-Kantian German idealist project to “scientize” (a better translation is “systematize”) the works of Immanuel Kant. The thinkers of that period thought there was a kind of incoherence between Kant’s first and second critiques in particular. There was an attempt to systematize Kant’s works to a single principle or thought. Also, Hegel was trying to come up with Kantian transcendental categories to account for the experience of motion. But, since Hegel drops the distinction between mind and world, what in Kant are best read as merely epistemic conditions that structure experience and justification become metaphysical laws that structure the world itself. Kant’s approach to the mind is much more in line with modern cognitive science than Hegel’s metaphysics.

2. Mao’s most famous work on dialectics is “On Contradiction.” Mao writes, “Before it explodes, a bomb is a single entity in which opposites coexist in given conditions. The explosion takes place only when a new condition, ignition, is present. An analogous situation arises in all those natural phenomena which finally assume the form of open conflict to resolve old contradictions and produce new things.” What do you think of Mao’s explanation?

Mao’s point in “On Contradiction” about the united front, which was perfectly right in Mao’s context, does not require the metaphysics of the rest of the article. One doesn’t need all the weird metaphysics to point out that when interests align that there can be and is unity between classes against a common enemy. Mao’s point on the united front is correct despite the problematic parts of the article. I have a great respect for Mao’s work as a whole, but he was no philosopher. I think it was Luis Althusser who said Mao is a deep thinker, not a

technical one. Marxism has a scientific core despite the attempt to package it in unscientific Hegelian metaphysical jargon. Mao was a genius regardless of his big errors here.

The idea that all science boils down to a handful of dialectical laws is ridiculous. That isn't how science works. Read Mao's description of how a bomb works in "On Contradiction." Then go try to make a bomb. Let's see how helpful dialectical mysticism is. Now, go study chemistry and engineering for a few years and try. That should tell you the relative importance of dialectics. What Mao is doing in the article is not giving a real, useful scientific explanation. He is just expressing a bomb's explosion in metaphysical terms pulled out of thin air (well, pulled out of Hegelian philosophy). Here is another example: The revisionist Communist Party USA used to talk about the law of how quantitative change adds up to qualitative change. They used the example of how even though there is never a threshold of when a pile of sand becomes a mountain, if you add a single grain of sand as a quantitative increase over and over, it will add up to a mountain. This might seem right for five seconds until you ask yourself 'is a mountain really just a big mole hill?' No. They are totally different things. A mountain is formed through a process of plate tectonics, a geological process of shifting land masses pushing upwards. Adding grains of sand to a pile of sand does not give you a mountain no matter how much you add. It gives you a big pile of sand formed by a totally different process. I could go on and on.

The Marxism of the past appropriated some of the jargon of dialectics, but all of what is scientific in Marxism can be stated without the metaphysics. Think of how diverse the sciences are: physics, biology, hydrology, linguistics, social science, mathematics, geology, cognitive science and neurology, structural engineering, the most advanced revolutionary science of Leading Light Communism, and so on. Do all the sciences really boil down to three or four laws? Of course not. I mentioned mathematics. If one counts addition as a science, then there are some special problems. Kurt Godel proved that any finite set of laws that are powerful enough to generate all the truths of addition necessarily contains a contradiction (a set of laws that contains a contradiction will generate all statements, including all the truths of addition). Dialectics is not predictive nor really explanatory. It is more like a metaphysical rhetoric that people try to make fit science and

phenomena. But the actual science gets on just fine without it. It is a kind of superfluous rhetoric. A good example of this is the Cultural Revolution debate in China on whether class struggle or unity is principal under socialism. The polemicists of that period made an important, simple debate of whether class struggle should be the main focus under socialism or whether the main focus should be unifying society around building up the productive forces into a bizarre debate of whether, ontologically speaking, “one divides into two” or “two unifies into one.” Again, they were taking a real issue and casting it in superfluous, metaphysical rhetoric. Such metaphysics just serves to obscure the real issue. It harms and disempowers the masses.

Let’s return to Mao’s work. What Maoists say about how a primary aspect can change and become secondary and vice versa is no great discovery. Things change. Important things can become less important. Less important things can become more important. Is this some great dialectical discovery? No, it is a banality that every child knows. Stating that things can change, that the primary aspect can become secondary and vice versa is not stating anything scientific. Stating that does not predict anything. It is describing phenomena in dialectical jargon. It is a description of a particular kind, a metaphysical kind. It is using a certain kind of metaphor with unfortunate metaphysical baggage. Unlike science, it predicts nothing, explains nothing. Now, if dialectics was a real science you would have laws that actually predicted in a useful way. For example, please, oh master dialecticians, tell us the universal conditions in nature (dialectics purports to be universal) that would allow us to predict when a primary becomes secondary? Tell me, under what conditions X, Y, Z will a primary become secondary? Under what conditions does a second aspect become a third aspect? If dialectics can’t say when/where/how these changes happen, just that they happen then it is no science. Contrast, for example, the dialectical, metaphysical description that things change to the description in chemistry that predicts the conditions under which liquids become solids. There is a difference between a metaphysical description and a predictive scientific one.

3. Can you say a little about what makes something a real science?

Science is a body of knowledge, a set of theories, propositions, whatever, that have a high degree of both predictive and explanatory power. Predictive power is how well a theory predicts. What this is should be obvious. Explanatory power is a little more tricky. I'm not going to get it all here, because that would be long and drawn out. But, let me use an example. Prior to the development of the sun-centered model of the solar system, there was a model of the solar system that was geo-centric. The motions of the planets were based on ad hoc descriptions of their apparent motions called "epicycles." When Copernicus first provided his sun-centered model, it lacked the predictive power of the epicycle model because all the details hadn't been worked out in the sun-centered model yet. Specifically, Copernicus hadn't gotten the orbits exactly right since he was still thinking in terms of pure circles. Thomas Khun discusses some of this in his book on the structure of scientific revolutions. Nonetheless, Copernicus' model gradually was refined and the old model was exposed. Even though the predictive power may have been a bit off, more farsighted people could see the potential in his model because of its elegance and simplicity contrary to the prior model. Simplicity, predicting more with less, accounting for more with less, is one of the characteristics of a more scientific theory. For example, if you have a body of observations and you have two theories that account for them, but let's say one theory does so with less premises, laws, etc. than the other one, then the more simpler theory has more explanatory power, Occum's razor. This is not all there is to explanatory power, but it is part of it. There is a lot more to say here, but I will leave it here for now.

4. What is scientific about Karl Marx's economics?

Marx's original project was "scientific socialism," using the most advanced science to reach the goal of communism. His mathematical modeling of exploitation was a big advance even if the labor theory of value has been surpassed today, even if his dialectics was a big error. Georg Lukacs was right when he said you can reject all of Marx's predictions and still be a Marxist. Marxism isn't about following the letter of Marx. Lukacs was wrong when he associated the scientific core of Marx with the dialectical method. The scientific core is the

mathematical modeling to generate prediction and explanation regarding exploitation and social change, the modeling of how history changes, how society changes, and so on, all of this can be stated without dialectics. Hegel's record is mixed. His approach to the mind, for example, is a regression. Kant's idea that the mind structures experience, and his functionalist, psychologist descriptions of this, are more in line with contemporary mind science than Hegel. Even John Locke's clunky models of the mind are closer to contemporary mind science than Hegel. But, Hegel's historicism was certainly an advance in other areas.

5. But isn't all science really metaphysics too?

There may be metaphysical, ontological implications to science, but one can be anti-realist about the ontology. Ontology as ontology is superfluous. After all, science changes and so do the ontological implications of science. Science is a tool, not 'the book of nature.' If you want to have scientific socialism, then you need to understand the most advanced stuff out there. And that isn't dialectics.

The word "metaphysics," as I am sure you know, comes from how the librarians at Alexandria arranged certain works of Aristotle's. Ontology, the study of being itself, what kinds of things there are — debates about whether universals are real in the same way particulars are, debates about whether numbers are real in the same way trees are, and so on — is all part of metaphysics. Although Aristotle was a genius and one of the greatest scientists of all time, metaphysics represents a kind approach divorced from science, divorced from prediction, experiment, etc. It is more a way of looking at the world and trying to tease out the answers to certain questions about existence, but existence understood in an incorrect and 'folksy' way. Here, I am a big fan of both Kant's and Ludwig Wittgenstein's epistemic turns that look at how and why certain incorrect questions are generated along with the metaphysics associated with those incorrect questions. This approach is similar to how Marx deals with ideologies by examining under what conditions they arise. Philosophic metaphysics, ontology, is kind of like a souped-up folk understanding of the world. It's like if you had a folk understanding of the world, but then teased out all the implications, making the folksy understanding consistent and technical, but the whole project is misguided to begin

with. Here I am talking about 'folk understanding' kind of the same way that eliminative materialists talk about 'folk psychology,' although I have differences with them, obviously.

6. Are you saying science is universal?

Actually it is the exact opposite. The dialecticians claim they have a few keys to universal science to unlock everything in the universe. I stated very clearly that science is a diverse collection of different projects with different, but often related organizational principles. How the different sciences related to each other is how Wittgenstein conceived games relating to each other. There is no single set of principles that all games reduce to, no single set of criteria. What makes a game a game is that it has a family resemblance to the other games. Think of the difference between three circles overlapping in a Venn Diagram and a chain of three circles where they overlap like a bike lock chain. This is obviously oversimplified (the overlaps are more complex actually, they just don't have a single center that counts as an 'essence') to make the point. The latter, the "bike chain," is closer to the relationship between games.

7. Can you speak about low and high science?

Low science is the form of the science that allows the high science to become relevant as a weapon of the proletariat. Low science is more formulaic, more repetitive. Just read Sendero's old literature or Chinese Maoist literature. High science is more aimed at working out the details of the scientific advance and even pushing it forward, low science aimed at creating the unity to implement that advance on the ground by unifying the revolutionary class for revolution. There is the advanced work, then there is 'Marxism-Leninism,' 'Maoism,' etc. With Leading Light, we try to design our materials to reach both the intellectual revolutionary and the semi-literate proletarian. It similar to Antonio Gramsci's point that it took a Lenin to make Marxism into a force of history.

8. What about when Socrates talks about dialectics?

There are different senses of “dialectics.” I like the “sense” of dialectics that is found in Plato, at least his earlier works. The topic of this discussion within the revolutionary tradition is not Socrates’ dialectics, it is formal systems of dialectics found in much of the Marxist tradition (the handful of laws that supposedly add up to a mega-science) and in Hegel himself (at least his more mature works). The topic that is usually discussed are those forms of dialectics that purport to be science. I have no problem with Socrates’ “sense” of the word. Questioning is important. We should not be too comfortable in our conclusions. I even recommend ‘more Socrates, less Hegel,’ more reflection, less dogma.

9. Can you contrast science and dialectics, stagnation and evolution?

Modern chemistry did not simply appear in its current form. It was the process of a long journey of scientific discovery. The reason sciences like physics or chemistry or even revolutionary science develop is exactly because they are scientific. They are open to changing along certain lines, and sometimes even those lines can shift. Contrast this to formal dialectics, the last evolution of which was Mao’s addition of the supposed “law of the negation of the negation” more than a half century ago. This kind of metaphysical stagnation is very different from the very active development of the sciences over time. Science is very different than metaphysics. Science may have ontological implications, but so does any claim about the world. Science does not see its ontological implications as unchanging, eternal. Science evolves.

More on dialectics, high, and low science

June 18, 2014

The following letter was sent to the Leading Light:

“Dear Leading Light,

I found the following article online:

Let’s invent a philosophy. Apoplectical Hyperrealism.

It’s origins are in a German mystic called...Bagel. Unfortunately no one’s sure what Porge Bagel said because he always spoke with his mouth full, so our ideas about him mainly come from a philosopher and revolutionary called Narks.

Writing with his friend Angels, Narks put it this way:

“I turned the Bagel upside down, and scooped out the gastronomical filling, discarding the stale outer crust.

- The Gnomic and Orthodontic Manuscripts (1944)”

Narks wrote many books using the tasty nuggets squeezed from Bagel, but somehow never got around to explaining what they were. Fortunately though, Angels wrote one and a half books explaining it, and their followers have been able to piece it all together. The three principles are as follows:

1) The principle of Fragmentation and Reconstitution: All things are constantly falling apart and coming back together, but in a different order.

For instance, when you breathe out, you are losing a part of yourself – Fragmenting the carbon dioxide from your lifeblood into the universe. But man cannot breathe out without thereafter breathing in, for without breath there is no life.

Man reconstitutes himself by drawing in breath, which is inevitably followed in an iron law of nature by exhalation.

When you eventually die your atoms are Fragmented into the soil, to Reconstitute as a tree or another person. So reality itself is breathing in and out, unable to ever stop. This is the Apoplexy of Apoplectic Hyperrealism.

2) The Principle of Comparison: Everything looks a bit like something else.

A man with a full head of hair resembles one with a small bald patch, who resembles one with a larger bald patch, who resembles a skinhead. Thus there is a chain of keratin from the hairiest hippy to the most shaven of punks, proving that if you change enough details, anything is a bit like its opposite.

3) Resemblance of the Resemblance: Sometimes, something looks so much like something else, it outshines the thing it looks like.

So, Lady Gaga is like Madonna, but with even worse clothes, a gayer fanbase and even more formulaic songs. Lady Gaga, the Resemblance of Madonna, has Reconstituted the Fragmentation of Madonna's attributes into a new, lower form.

I Can't Believe It's Not Butter is a butter-substitute so buttery, it replaces butter in the fridges of people who don't like margarine. The imitation has replaced the original by taking the main points, and exaggerating them. This is the Hyperrealism.

This wonderful philosophy which perfectly explains absolutely bloody everything is not popular with those who control the world. The superrich are the only people with enough money to spend all day in bed – hence their name, the boudoirsie.

They are threatened by its profound implications, and have all the scientists in the world brainwashed into accepting a false idea of reality. This is ironic, because all the discoveries of every single scientist confirm Apoplectic Hyperrealism.

When you boil water, the molecules of H₂O are Fragmented from the body of the liquid, eventually Reconstituting back into liquid in a different place. Small droplets of water floating in air Compare to particles of smoke, and as the Comparison increases, eventually the water (as steam) Compares to smoke more than the Smoke does, rising higher and being hotter.

Smoke that doesn't float is ash, and as steam turns back into water, it compares itself more and more to ash and therefore falls to the ground in a light sprinkle.

This view of the universe is both simple and obvious from a thousand daily phenomena and a million scientific facts, yet almost no one can see it. Such is the power of ideology.

The philosophy isn't just an unquestionable scientific truth, but also the only hope of humanity.

The great revolutionary Lemming used its principles to lead a people's coup, and even though the regime he set up turned into a barbaric dictatorship, that's only because his successor (Stealing) wasn't sufficiently Apoplectic.

There have been other glorious failures in many countries, and one day one of them will last more than a few years and spread through the whole world.

Finally, we should make clear that there is another philosophy called Dialectical Materialism, which may look superficially similar but is completely different.

Dialectical Materialism is a collection of incredibly vague, quasi-theological principles which can be interpreted to mean anything so as to 'explain' any and every phenomenon.

All refutations are simply condemned with circular logic as 'undialectical'. The evidence is cherry-picked and distorted to make it fit. The followers of this sad delusion form small warring factions, yet have spent the last 150 years believing they can use its mantras to lead humanity to salvation.

Once they can be convinced of Apoplectical Hyperrealism, they can join our cause – and then, comrades, the whole world will be Apoplectic.¹

Can you comment some more on dialectics? Thank you."

Obviously there are some problems with the article's one-sided portrayal of the Bolshevik revolution, Lenin, and Stalin. However, these are secondary issues. The article correctly points out that the fictional "Apoplectical Hyperrealism," which is suppose to represent dialectics, is unscientific. Dialectics has no real predictive power nor explanatory power. Real science does. It does not evolve as real sciences does. Unlike science, dialectics is stagnant, its three or four laws are eternal. Think how very different dialectics looks to a real science like chemistry or even revolutionary science, Leading Light Communism. Dialectics is metaphysics. The only serious argument that can be made on behalf of dialectics is that dialectics can serve as what Plato called a "noble lie." It is a kind of "lie" told in service of a greater truth.

Obviously there are some problems with the article's one-sided portrayal of the Bolshevik revolution, Lenin, and Stalin. However, these are secondary issues. The article correctly points out that the fictional "Apoplectical Hyperrealism," which is suppose to represent dialectics, is unscientific. Dialectics has no real predictive power nor explanatory power. Real science does. It does not evolve as real sciences does. Unlike science, dialectics is stagnant, its three or four laws are eternal. Think how very different dialectics looks to a real science like chemistry or even revolutionary science, Leading Light Communism. Dialectics is metaphysics. The only serious argument that

can be made on behalf of dialectics is that dialectics can serve as what Plato called a “noble lie.” It is a kind of “lie” told in service of a greater truth.

The high science of a revolution is the more intellectual form of the revolutionary breakthrough. It is full of subtlety and nuance. Its propositions will tend to be less certain, more qualified. It is more technical. It requires a greater level of training to grasp. By contrast, the low science is a popularized form of the breakthrough that allows the ideology to become a force in the world. The low science is easier to grasp; it does not require formal education. It will be simpler and more formulaic. It will be more repetitive. It will contain mnemonic devices for the illiterate. It is a weaponized form of the ideology that can be wielded in the hands of the masses. It is the form of the ideology that creates the unity among the masses in order to really win. It will share certain qualities with myth, even have a religious tone at times. Low science will be filled with hype. For example, the political economy has to be simplified into general formulas that can be applied and easily understood by those who may not have much education. There must be clarity about who are enemies are and who our friends are. The vision of the future must be both simple and inspiring. Confidence, reassurance, hope must be expressed. A revolutionary movement cannot go to the people and say “we might win, please join us.” We have to say, “our victory is guaranteed.” Most people will not risk their lives on a “might.” Dialectics has been a part of past communist myth. It has historically been used to give the revolutionary movement a sense of destiny, assurance, certainty, hope. Our people experience hard times. They endure great suffering. In the dark times, it is especially important to give people a reason to fight on, assurance, hope that all is not lost. Morale is important. Religion has played this role sometimes, but religion is too wedded to the very oppression we are trying to uproot. Remember that we are asking people to literally live and die for the people, for the world that is to be, for the organization, for its leadership. We are asking them to “carry their lives on their finger tips,” to sacrifice everything, to lose and spill blood. This is not an easy thing for most people, even if they are terribly exploited and oppressed. We must make revolution live not simply in the mind, but we must get people to feel revolution in every ounce of their being, in their hearts and souls, down to their bones.

Personality cults have often been part of the low science. Cults are one way to forge unity, to give certainty, to inspire, to pull people through the hard times. However, not all cults are created equal. There are cults that emphasize the leader's intellect or genius. Think of Lenin as teacher or the cult of the genius Lin Biao tried to erect around Mao. In Peru, Gonzalo's cult of the "mastermind" emphasized this. There is the cult of the father, the provider, the stern protector, the disciplinarian. Stalin was often portrayed this way. There is even the cult of the motherly leader, who coddles and pampers, in northern Korea. There is the cult of the man of action, the heroic guerrilla: Che Guevara, for example. Usually, many of these qualities exist within the same cult, although usually one archetype is principal. There are also cults of the organization as a whole, as in Kampuchea. Just as not all lower science is created equal, not all cults are either. A cult of the genius, the teacher, is preferable to, less patriarchal than, the cult of the father, for example. Cults can arise spontaneously as part of the low science. This happens because, on one level, a void is left when science and secular culture replaces religion. However, on another level, not everyone can immediately grasp the high science. So the void is filled by a secular force, the leader or organization. It is also a result of the need for hope and certainty. Cults also can arise by design, by the conscious direction of the organization and the masses. Low science is part of the ABCs of power that must be mastered in order to win, to really make revolution.

In the past, low science and high science were often muddled. Marx himself seemed to think dialectics was part of the high-scientific breakthrough, as did Lenin and Mao. However, at best, dialectics should be thought of as part of the low science that muddled its way up. Dialectics has historically served, consciously or not, as part of the low science of the revolutionary movement. Historically, dialectics has been part of a package of secular myth used by communists. "Dialectical materialism proves our victory is inevitable," for example. One of the problems with using dialectics as part of the low science is that it appears intellectual enough and technical enough that mid-level intellectuals who should know better can easily get confused. They begin to muddle the high and low science. This results in a dogma that becomes a fetter on advancing the real science. Among others, the Marxist-Leninists and Maoists of today are stuck in the muddle of the low science of past revolutionary breakthroughs that

have now been surpassed by the Leading Light. They continue to spout vulgarized formulas from the past, as though making revolution today were a matter of simply adhering to the Marxist-Leninist or Maoist cookbook. The world has changed. The smoke and mirrors and pseudo-intellectualism is not needed to give people a sense of destiny, to give them hope. Straight appeals to destiny and a world-historic mission can accomplish this without the pseudo-scientific muddle. Just as the high science has advanced, so too must the low science. Some “noble lies” are better than others.

I do not care what individuals may have invested in their Marxist-Leninist or Maoist identities. I care about serving the people and the Earth. The lives of the masses do matter. Their lives do count. Those who refuse to put the science, its organization and leaders, in command are doing a disservice to the people because what the people need is victory on a global scale. You may be comfortable with lazy dogma, but the masses deserve better. The capitalists have updated their science of oppression. The enemy is more and more sophisticated. We can either remain in the past and continue to stagnate and lose or we can dare to win. Put the most advanced revolutionary science, all-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light Communism, in command.

For thousands and thousands of years, the masses have suffered every indignity imaginable. The planet is dying, on its last breath. We will not be stuck forever in this nightmare. There is a light in the darkness. The masses are waking. The revolution, its science, its organization and leaders, are rising. Our destiny is to rid this world of all exploitation, all indignity, all cruelty, all suffering. The forces of history have converged to put the choice before every one of us: to be part of the solution, destiny, forward into the glorious future or to be like the dinosaurs, dead and past. We will never stop fighting, no matter what the sacrifice, for the people, for the planet, for our children, for ourselves, for the future that is to be. Brothers and sisters, together, we are the source of infinite power. Every problem will be solved. Serve the people. Care for each other. Peace. Prosperity. Sharing. Community. Creativity. Fun. Happiness. Harmony with Mother Earth. Victory will be ours. Forward, always forward. We are invincible. Our sun is rising. Our day is coming.

More on dialectics: Two against the many

September 25, 2014

Recently, someone stated:

“Some evolutionary biologists, such as Richard Lewontin and the late Stephen Jay Gould, have tried to employ dialectical materialism in their approach. They view dialectics as playing a precautionary heuristic role in their work. From Lewontin’s perspective, we get this idea:

Dialectical materialism is not, and never has been, a programmatic method for solving particular physical problems. Rather, a dialectical analysis provides an overview and a set of warning signs against particular forms of dogmatism and narrowness of thought. It tells us, ‘Remember that history may leave an important trace. Remember that being and becoming are dual aspects of nature. Remember that conditions change and that the conditions necessary to the initiation of some process may be destroyed by the process itself. Remember to pay attention to real objects in time and space and not lose them in utterly idealized abstractions. Remember that qualitative effects of context and interaction may be lost when phenomena are isolated.’ And above all else, ‘Remember that all the other caveats are only reminders and warning signs whose application to different circumstances of the real world is contingent.’

Gould shared similar views regarding a heuristic role for dialectical materialism. He wrote ‘Dialectical thinking should be taken more seriously by Western scholars, not discarded because some nations of the second world have constructed a cardboard version as an official political doctrine.’ Furthermore, when presented as guidelines for a philosophy of change, not as dogmatic precepts true by fiat, the three classical laws of dialectics embody a holistic vision that views change as interaction among components of complete systems, and sees the components themselves not as a priori

entities, but as both products and inputs to the system. Thus, the law of 'interpenetrating opposites' records the inextricable interdependence of components: the 'transformation of quantity to quality' defends a systems-based view of change that translates incremental inputs into alterations of state; and the 'negation of negation' describes the direction given to history because complex systems cannot revert exactly to previous states."

There are many issues here. Firstly, surely there are a couple of scientists that think dialectics is relevant to their work just as there are surely others who think religious faith is. In fact, you could probably find more scientists who think Islam or Catholicism is relevant to their work. Just because a handful of credible scientists think as much does not mean that it is the consensus of the scientific community generally. The reality is that the consensus is dialectics is not relevant in any special way to the understanding of the numerous sciences that exist: biology, physics, engineering, hydrology, neurology, linguistics, etc. This also goes for Islam, Christianity, and numerous other irrelevant metaphysical packages. For example, if you are going to study physics at the university, they do have math requirements. They don't require classes on Hegel and Karl Marx as prerequisites for a reason. This is because the consensus of the scientific community overwhelmingly does not see it as useful. There is an appeal to authority going on in your comment, even if it is only an appeal to two authorities when the scientific community as whole sees it differently. Mao criticized such appeals as "pointing one finger against the many," or in this case, two fingers.

Secondly, there is nothing especially interesting or informative about the definition of dialectics offered in the passages you cite. I don't disagree that it is good advice to avoid dogmatism and narrowness in one's thinking, to keep in mind the world is complicated, to not overreach, that reality as experienced matters, things are interconnected and interdependent, and so on. This is all well and good. On one level, you would be hard pressed to find anyone who disagreed with such advice. Such advice will come off as trite banalities to most scientists. There is a lot of intellectual dishonesty going on when one dresses up such advice as dialectical profundity. It kind of reminds me of Shakespeare's Polonius, the king's adviser in

Hamlet, who strings together pseudo-intellectual platitudes. “To thine ownself be true” is not exactly false as meaningless, as is shown very dramatically in the character of Hamlet, whose instability and indecision problematize the whole idea the self as a single, unconflicted, knowable thing. Hamlet kills Polonius physically, but the act of doing so is also a metaphor for the character of Hamlet problematizing the platitude about truth to one’s self. Shakespeare was notorious for this kind of metatextual point, probably the most famous case of this is the “Mousetrap,” Hamlet’s play within the play.

Thirdly, there is a slight of hand going on. You quote a passage about the informal sense of “dialectics” used by Socrates, especially in Plato’s earlier work. Nobody is going to find this kind of “dialectics” objectionable. It is fine, if not trite, to recommend intellectual caution. But then you quickly pass into a discussion of a stronger, metaphysical sense found in the Maoist language of “unity of opposites,” “negation of the negation,” “transformation of quantity into quality,” and so on. Finding scientists who think this stronger, metaphysical, Hegelian, or Maoist sense of dialectics is relevant to science is going to be a much more difficult task than finding ones that think the Socratic sense is important.

Dialectics is not about prediction nor explanation as real science is. It is metaphysical, obscurantist rhetoric that is forced onto the world:

“The Marxism of the past appropriated some of the jargon of dialectics, but all of what is scientific in Marxism can be stated without the metaphysics. Think of how diverse the sciences are: physics, biology, hydrology, linguistics, social science, mathematics, geology, cognitive science and neurology, structural engineering, the most advanced revolutionary science of Leading Light Communism, and so on. Do all the sciences really boil down to three or four laws? Of course not. I mentioned mathematics. If one counts addition as a science, then there are some special problems. Kurt Godel proved that any finite set of laws that are powerful enough to generate all the truths of addition necessarily contains a contradiction (a set of laws that contains a contradiction will generate all statements, including all the truths of addition). Dialectics is not

predictive nor really explanatory. It is more like a metaphysical rhetoric that people try to make fit science and phenomena. But the actual science gets on just fine without it. It is a kind of superfluous rhetoric. A good example of this is the Cultural Revolution debate in China on whether class struggle or unity is principal under socialism. The polemicists of that period made an important, simple debate of whether class struggle should be the main focus under socialism or whether the main focus should be unifying society around building up the productive forces into a bizarre debate of whether, ontologically speaking, 'one divides into two' or 'two unifies into one.' Again, they were taking a real issue and casting it in superfluous, metaphysical rhetoric. Such metaphysics just serves to obscure the real issue. It harms and disempowers the masses.

Let's return to Mao's work. What Maoists say about how a primary aspect can change and become secondary and vice versa is no great discovery. Things change. Important things can become less important. Less important things can become more important. Is this some great dialectical discovery? No, it is a banality that every child knows. Stating that things can change, that the primary aspect can become secondary and vice versa is not stating anything scientific. Stating that does not predict anything. It is describing phenomena in dialectical jargon. It is a description of a particular kind, a metaphysical kind. It is using a certain kind of metaphor with unfortunate metaphysical baggage. Unlike science, it predicts nothing, explains nothing. Now, if dialectics was a real science you would have laws that actually predicted in a useful way. For example, please, oh master dialecticians, tell us the universal conditions in nature (dialectics purports to be universal) that would allow us to predict when a primary becomes secondary? Tell me, under what conditions X, Y, Z will a primary become secondary? Under what conditions does a second aspect become a third aspect? If dialectics can't say when/where/how these changes happen, just that they happen then it is no science. Contrast, for example, the dialectical, metaphysical description that things change to the description in chemistry

*that predicts the conditions under which liquids become solids. There is a difference between a metaphysical description and a predictive scientific one.*ⁱⁱⁱ

Your choice of language makes my point for me: “dialectics.. sees.. records.. defends.. describes..” Lacking from your description is a claim that it predicts and explains in any meaningful way.

Fourthly, dialectics, in the strong sense, is not part of the scientific core of Marxism. Marx’s contributions were scientific despite dialectical rhetoric. Marx’s work is very marked by the time in which he lived. He wrote at a time when Hegelianism dominated the intellectual scene. However, the scientific core of Marx’s work is not the dialectics. Rather, the scientific core of Marx’s work is made up of things like the incorporation of mathematical modeling into theories of revolutionary social change, structuralist analysis of power, economy, and historical change, etc. What is scientific in Marx can be stated without the metaphysical baggage. This is true even though Marx himself seemed to think it wasn’t. Marx seemed to have believed, at least sometimes, that dialectics was the most important part of his work. He seems a bit like Isaac Newton in this respect. Newton was a scientific genius who revolutionized the study of the physical world. Yet few remember that Newton himself thought his most important work was not his “natural philosophy.” Newton paid far more attention to projects like calculating the date of the end of the world based on hints in the Bible or turning lead into gold. What Newton seemed to think of as his best work, we now see as crackpot. Similarly, Marx’s belief in the dialectical method or the metaphysical parts of Mao’s *On Contradiction* should be seen the same way. This is another big difference between real science and dialectics:

“The reason sciences like physics or chemistry or even revolutionary science develop is exactly because they are scientific. They are open to changing along certain lines, and sometimes even those lines can shift. Contrast this to formal dialectics, the last evolution of which was Mao’s addition of the supposed ‘law of the negation of the negation’ more than a half century ago. This kind of metaphysical stagnation is very different from the very active development of the sciences over time. Science is very different than

*metaphysics. Science may have ontological implications, but so does any claim about the world. Science does not see its ontological implications as unchanging, eternal. Science evolves.*ⁱⁱⁱ

Dialectics is not part of the high science of revolution. It is not even good low science, good myth, because it too easily confuses mid-level intellectuals, and maybe even confuses a few Goulds or Lewontins here and there who may be decent biologists, but not great philosophers or epistemologists. There is no serious debate between those who advocate dialectics and those who do not in the sciences just as there is no real debate between creationists and evolutionists. The debate doesn't really exist in serious philosophy either. You will still find a Hegel expert here and there who might still look at the world through the lenses of dialectics just as you might find a classicist who swears everything worth knowing is in the fragments of the pre-Socratics. However, such stuff in the intellectual world is not serious work, but should be and usually is regarded as the (occasionally interesting) theatrics of eccentrics. Slavoj Zizek, who likes to talk about Jaques Lacan and Hegel, is a good example here. He may be entertaining. Some of his readings of texts contain some insight, but to think there is anything like a coherent theory tying it all together would be silly. He gives some hit-and-run readings of this and that. He then wraps it up in a technical-sounding, obscurantist rhetoric. It can be entertaining, but there is no real theory there. This is something Noam Chomsky recently pointed out.

Lastly, real Marxism is not some foundational super science that accounts for everything from social conflicts to mathematics to atomic motion to bomb explosions. Mao's account of how explosions happen in *On Contradiction*, for example, is not getting at the fundamental laws that govern all things. Mao's perspective of how a bomb works is that of someone who doesn't know much about chemistry, physics, or engineering. It is a folksy explanation that has been dressed up with vocabulary from German metaphysics from two centuries ago. It is the explanation of someone who really does not know how a bomb might work. Real Marxism, by contrast, is using the best science to reach the goal of Leading Light Communism, total liberation, ending all oppression. Real science isn't dialectics.

Had Mao not led a quarter of the world's population in an attempt to throw off the shackles of centuries of oppression, nobody would be discussing the metaphysics in *On Contradiction*. Mao's genius is not in his technical understanding of philosophy or science. Mao's genius was as a revolutionary tactician and strategist. Those who are promoting Mao as some kind of master of dialectical super science, a master of negating the negation and dividing one into two, are really doing a disservice to the masses. It's cult of personality fantasy. The masses need real science. The masses need atomic weapons, not dull knives. The masses need all-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light Communism.

Science vs. Dialectics, again

October 6, 2014

A friend stated:

“‘Dialectical’ thinking is a way of enframing actual contents. It reveals them and itself in their changing aspect and nature, not sub specie aeternitatis. It opposes metaphysical thought of a religious or prescientific kind, but not only. It points to the fact that there is no absolute SCIENCE, but many sciences (limited, partial, conflicting, constantly evolving and negating themselves, falsifiable, etc.) Dialectics is a pointer that shows us the way forward... By saying that dialectics is only a set of platitudes with no value (you could also say the same about the earth not being flat, or the sun going round the earth, or the proletariat being the class called to destroy the class society) you are giving credit to the metaphysical way in every aspect of human life. Metaphysics is so embedded in our way of reasoning about everything that, as was the case with that character of Molière who suddenly realized he was speaking in prose, we don’t even notice, we don’t even know that we don’t know.”

Thank you for your comment.

You claim that dialectics is merely a warning not to see scientific claims as eternal and absolute. This falls under what I have called the “Socratic sense” of “dialectics.” You would be hard pressed to find anyone who studies the history or philosophy of science who would say scientific claims are eternal and absolute. Everyone is well aware that science evolves: Newton, Einstein, quantum mechanics, etc. This is not an observation one needs Hegel, Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, nor dialectics, to make. It is made all the time in a far less obscurantist ways by numerous others from Socrates himself to Thomas Kuhn. Saying such things falls in the realm of “no duh” for most educated people. However, this is not the sense of “dialectics” found in Hegel, Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, etc. When they mention “dialectics,” they are speaking of it in a stronger sense. They are not just talking about some vague warnings against overreaching in our scientific

conclusions. They are talking about a very specific set of laws that are supposed to be at the heart of all sciences, are supposed to account for all things, are a kind of foundation for the sciences. These laws are laws like the law of the unity of opposites, the law of transformation of quantity into quality, the law of the negation of the negation, etc. Stalin seemed to think dialectics was at the heart of atomic physics. Lenin seemed to think its laws were at work in mathematics. Mao seemed to think it was important in understanding bombs in *On Contradiction*. In the two centuries since Hegel wrote, that this is all there is to dialectics should be a big indication that we are not dealing with a science. Sciences evolve in very dynamic ways. Dialectics, rather, is a metaphysical description, which is why it remains largely unchanged after two centuries.

Dialectics, in the Hegelian, Marxist, and Maoist senses, is a rhetoric, a way of describing the world. It is a forced description that has little to do with the scientific virtues of explanatory power and predictive power. It is not science. It is a way of forcing our observations about the world into a set of descriptions that purport to be universal and unchanging. It is obscurantist and superfluous. It is not about prediction nor explanation. Marx's work is scientific, contains explanatory and predictive power, not because of his dialectical rhetoric, but despite it. Everything in Marx, Lenin, and Mao worth stating can be stated in a clearer way without the metaphysical, Hegelian baggage.

The whole model of human knowledge that informs dialectics comes from metaphysics and theology. In ancient and Medieval times, it used to be believed that all the diverse sciences were really just branches of single foundational realm of knowledge. For the more philosophically inclined this was metaphysics or ontology, for the more religiously inclined, this was theology. The idea was that scientific knowledge somehow depended on and was, in some sense, derived from knowledge of fundamental being or God. So, metaphysicians and theologians would try to make scientific discoveries fit their metaphysical, religious worldview. This is what dialecticians are doing. You can say the big bang was put into motion by God. You can say that evolution was set in motion by God. However, understanding the big bang or evolution doesn't require God. God adds nothing to the explanatory or predictive power there. To add God in this way just

adds a obscurity, it is superfluous to the scientific explanations just as dialectics is.

Leading Light Communism is about advancing the science of revolution in an all-round way. It may make people uncomfortable, intellectually speaking, that they are going to have to shake this bit of dogma. However, the proletariat deserves better. We do not choose our ideology based on what is comfortable to us. Are you really going to feed the masses this metaphysical nonsense in the twenty-first century? Intellectuals need to wake up. It is not about your needs. We need to arm the masses with the best weapons available. Dialectics is not even a bad weapon, it is smoke and mirrors. We follow the Leading Light of truth, as it can best be known by science.



Part Three
Science and Heroes

Smashing idols

September 12, 2014

The Old Testament states:

“You shall have no other gods before Me. You shall not make for yourself an idol, or any likeness of what is in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the water under the earth. You shall not worship them or serve them; for I, the LORD your God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children, on the third and the fourth generations of those who hate Me, but showing lovingkindness to thousands, to those who love Me and keep My commandments.”^{iv}

The critique of pagan idolatry is held to be so important that it is the first commandment received by Moses in the Old Testament of Judaism and Christianity. The god of the “peoples of the Book,” of Jews and Christians, is also the god of Muslims. He is a jealous god who does not like competition, be it in the form of other gods or science. Islam has its origins in earlier Middle Eastern monotheism. From its religious relatives, Islam inherits the rejection of pagan idolatry. The rejection of pagan idolatry was central to Islam from the beginning and continues to be central today. For example, today, the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS or ISIL) has demolished graves and shrines in the name of opposing idolatry. Such actions also serve their political agenda of stroking up sectarian conflicts, especially between Sunni and Shia. It was even reported that some members of the Islamic State proclaimed that if they conquered Mecca, they would demolish the Kaaba in order to put an end to the “worship of stones,” although this report has not been verified.^v Similarly, Islamic radicals distance themselves from secular nationalism, which they see as a way of elevating the nation as a kind of idol. This is similar to how some Christian sects refuse to salute the US flag. This line of thought is not new.

The Kaaba in Mecca traditionally housed many of the pagan-Arab religious idols prior to the rise of Islam. Prophet Muhammad made an enemy of many in Mecca when he sought to have the Kaaba dedicated only to the worship of Allah, not the various pagan gods whose images were housed within it. The Quraysh began fighting with the Islamic community over the issue. This resulted in Muhammad's migration, hijra, to Medina in 622 AD. Years later, Muhammad returned after the Muslims had defeated their Meccan opponents around 630. When they returned to the Kaaba, they removed the pagan idols, although allowed the black stone to remain. This is reported in the Hadith literature:

“When Allah’s Apostle arrived in Mecca, he refused to enter the Ka’ba while there were idols in it. So he ordered that they be taken out. The pictures of the (Prophets) Ibrahim and Ishmael, holding arrows of divination in their hands, were carried out. The Prophet said, ‘May Allah ruin them (i.e. the nonbelievers) for they knew very well that they (i.e. Ibrahim and Ishmael) never drew lots by these (divination arrows).’ Then the Prophet entered the Ka’ba and said. ‘Allahu Akbar’ in all its directions and came out and not offer any prayer therein.”^{vi}

According to Islam, Muhammad's confrontation with pagan idols is only the last in a chain of numerous previous prophets who had done the same. One of the more interesting criticisms of idolatry is found in the Koran's story of Prophet Ibrahim addressing silent pagan idols:

“He sneaked into the temple of their gods and addressed them: ‘Why don’t you eat from these offerings before you? What is the matter with you that you don’t even speak?’ Then he fell upon them, smiting them with his right hand. The people came running to the scene. ‘Would you worship that which you have carved with your own hands...’”^{vii}

Silence in the face of Ibrahim's questions lead to his rejection of the pagan idols. However, what should be obvious is just as the pagan idols do not eat food, Allah doesn't order pizza either. Nor does Allah really speak. Why should lack of consumption of food be proof enough for Ibrahim to doubt the pagan idols, but not Allah? A materialist

criticism is begun in this example, but then, instead of following the argument to its reasonable conclusion that no gods exist, Ibrahim does not apply the same criticisms to his own beliefs. The failure to follow through on the materialist critique, to apply it consistently, is seen in the example of Prophet Hud also:

“O my people! Why do you worship stone statues that you have made yourselves? These idols cannot give you anything or take anything away from you. You are clever people, why are doing something so foolish? Your Lord is only One, and He alone should be worshipped...”^{viii}

Idols are not only made from stone and earth, they also exist in the mind. The idols of stone and earth are far easier to topple than those in the mind. The most important building block of any idol are social relationships from which they originate and serve. Karl Marx stated that the secret of the holy family is the earthly family. God as creator, as father, of the universe is really a kind of social construct. It is a projection of human relationships onto the universe. Even though God’s origin is human, many fail to recognize God’s social origin. People are thus compelled by the very idol they themselves, as a society, have created. From the standpoint of truth, worshiping one idol, even if it exists only in the realm of ideas, is not fundamentally different from worshiping many idols of stone and mud. Like most religions, Islam subjects those gods that are not its own to a limited materialist critique. Islam begins a materialist analysis of pagan idols by tracing their origin to human agency, but fails to extend the materialist critique to its own idol, Allah. There is no reason to believe that the metaphysical and religious realms exist on their own. They are a product of our own activity, what Marx called “self alienation”:

“But that the secular basis detaches itself from itself and establishes itself as an independent realm in the clouds can only be explained by the cleavages and self-contradictions within this secular basis. The latter must, therefore, in itself be both understood in its contradiction and revolutionized in practice. Thus, for instance, after the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the holy family, the former must then itself be destroyed in theory and in practice.”^{ix}

Since the origin of the religious realm is our alienation from the processes of the minds and societies that create such a realm, overcoming the religious is a process of overcoming self alienation. Knowledge of society and self through science is the key to getting beyond the religious and other metaphysical outlooks. Marxists call tracing our conceptions of the world, including religious ideas and other ideologies, to their origins in class society “historical materialism.” By the time of Islam’s rise, Christianity had moved beyond its humble origins as a small sect of Judaism to become the official ideology of the Roman and post-Roman world. By the time of the rise of Islam in the 600s, Christianity had become the state religion of some of the Arab world’s most powerful neighbors. It was the state ideology in the what remained of the Western Roman world, but more importantly, of the Eastern Roman, the Byzantine, empire. The other major superpower near the Arab world was the Persian empire with its own religion, Zoroastrianism. Just as neighboring superpowers used their religions as an imperial glue, so too did the emerging Arab empire, what would become the Umayyad and other caliphates, have Islam. Islam, from its beginning, was very much tied to a very human political order. Just as the Vedic doctrines, karma, etc. of are used to justify the caste system of the Indian society, so too is the divine used to justify gender-caste system in Islam. Judaism, Christianity, even Buddhism, are similar in this respect. All religions arise from the contradictions of their society and serve a role in the power struggle. It is important to understand the process by which religious and other illusions arise. However, even though historical materialism is extremely important, science has developed other important tools that give insights into the origin of religion.

Today, cognitive and neuro science are also providing important epistemological insights into how people learn, how and why they develop and hold onto mistaken ideas, etc. This is not just to make the obvious point that schizophrenics who hear voices are not altogether unlike some accounts of allegedly hearing the divine. Nor is this to repeat that Muhammad receiving the Koran was accompanied by symptoms of epilepsy. Even the Catholic Church goes out of its way to consult psychologists before it performs exorcisms, thus, despite themselves, pointing to the similarities between demon possession and mental illness. The epistemological implications of contemporary cognitive and neuro science are much deeper. For example, the great

philosopher and proto-cognitive scientist Immanuel Kant believed that the mind structured our experience of the world, our phenomenological field. Our minds and brains organize information a certain way. Kant called space and time “forms of intuition.” According to Kant, “transcendental categories” like that of cause and effect also structure the way information is organized and processed by our minds. For Kant, the forms of intuition and transcendental categories structure our experience of the world and place limits on how we know and what we can know. For Kant, the experience of space, especially what we perceive as the external world beyond our mind, was structured according to the laws of Euclidean geometry. Thus, according to such a view, there is a “transcendental” (or biological) fetter on the ability to conceive that two parallel lines can intersect. Such an idea was held to be as contradictory as the notion that a square triangle could exist. Thus Kant understood space as Isaac Newton did. However, in 1919, Arthur Eddington’s famous photographs during a solar eclipse showed that even lines of light bend. Physics has since recognized that space itself is curved by mass, which accounts for the gravitational effect. It may be difficult for us to wrap our heads around the idea because our brains seem to be hardwired to navigate the macroscopic world of ordinary, daily life. And, in our ordinary, daily life the world appears to us as macroscopic objects moving in a Euclidean field. However, the general rules that work well enough in ordinary circumstances break down in other circumstances. For example, they break down when examining subatomic particles. There are other examples of “mistakes” that we do not readily see. Even though we have blind spots in our vision, we do not see them without prompting. Another example: We may think we see color in our full visual field, but we really do not see color in our peripheral vision. This is why a person will not guess beyond the margin of error when trying to determine the color of random playing cards when displayed in her peripheral vision as she stares straight ahead. Another example: Our perception of temperature changes on our skin does not correspond to actual changes in a one-to-one way. Pain may work in a similar way, after a certain threshold is reached, additional infliction of violence may not be accompanied by additional experience of pain.

We know that the body is hardwired to fool itself in some contexts. Even though much of Sigmund Freud’s work is problematic, his

conception of the power of the unconscious over our lives suggests this kind of conclusion. Others, most famously, Ludwig Wittgenstein, have shown that how we express claims, how human language itself, is prone to generating pseudo-problems and false conceptions about the world. Similar to Kant's rejection of many traditional philosophic problems as a result of epistemologically overreaching, Wittgenstein showed how certain seemingly intractable philosophic questions were tied to the way language works. It is surely the case that the mistaken conceptions of the world, including religious ones, are a result of culture and power in human society, as Marx held. However, it is also surely the case that our neurology plays a role in why we make the mistakes we do. In Marx's day, cognitive and neuro science had not advanced enough to provide much insight into the origin of religion. However, today we know much more about how the mind and brain work. Even so, even the best critique alone will not get society as a whole beyond idolatry, beyond the religious. As Marx wrote, "The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it."^x To get beyond the realm of illusion, including the religious, once and for all, requires a reorganization of society led by the most advanced science, Leading Light Communism, in order to eliminate all the social inequalities that generate ignorance and illusion. Truth and practice are hammers that not only smash pagan gods, but all gods, including the god of Ibrahim and Muhammad. Lenin stated that there is nothing as radical as reality itself. Revolution is the doorway from the illusory to the real. Leading Light Communism is the way out of Plato's cave, from the shadows to the light.

On the inverse cripples

June 31, 2014

Through Zarathustra's remarks on the inverse cripples, Friedrich Nietzsche is criticizing modern intellectuals who are revered as geniuses:

"[F]or there are human beings who lack everything, except one thing of which they have too much — human beings who are nothing but a big eye or a big mouth or a big belly or anything at all that is big. Inverse cripples I call them.

'And when I came out of my solitude and crossed over this bridge for the first time I did not trust my eyes and looked and looked again, and said at last, 'An ear! And ear as big as a man!' I looked still more closely — and indeed, underneath the ear something was moving, something pitifully small and wretched and slender. And, no doubt of it, the tremendous ear was attached to a small, thin stalk — but this stalk was a human being! If one used a magnifying glass one could even recognize a tiny envious face; also, that bloated little soul was dangling from the stalk. The people, however, told me that this great ear was not only a human being, but a great one, a genius. But I never believed the people when they spoke of great men; and I maintained my belief that it was an inverse cripple who had too little of everything and too much of one thing.'

When Zarathustra had spoken thus to the hunchback and to those whose mouthpiece and advocate the hunchback was, he turned to his disciples in profound dismay and said: 'Verily, my friends, I walk among men as among the fragments and limbs of men. This is what is terrible for my eyes, that I find man in ruins and scattered as over a battlefield or a butcher-field. And when my eyes flee from the now to the past, they always find the same: fragments and limbs and dreadful accidents — but no human beings.'"^{xi}

There is the great chemist who knows nothing of Ludwig von Beethoven. There is the engineer who has never read Immanuel Kant. There is the economist who has not read William Shakespeare. There is the historian who knows nothing about Albert Einstein. There is the artist who has never read Karl Marx. There is the sociologist who knows nothing of Isaac Newton's laws. There is the great physicist who believes in the devil.

Bourgeois education, the university system, is highly specialized. It aims to develop an extreme level of specialization in a single area, usually discouraging broader education. This is not just true of the physical sciences and engineering, but it is true of the humanities. An individual might be highly adept at looking at the world through the lenses of his specialty, but that is all he can do. This allows him to see the problems within his specialty very clearly, but it makes him blind to the broader problems of the world. It also leads to a kind of compartmentalization of knowledge. People are not trained to connect their specialized knowledge to everyday life or to other areas. They have a very disjointed, unbalanced world view. It is kind of like a blind spot in reverse. A very tiny corner of the world can be seen very clearly, but the majority goes unseen and unnoticed.

This phenomenon ripples across broader bourgeois society. The United States has one of the most literate, educated populations in the world. Yet, according to a recent poll, more Americans believe in the existence of a literal hell and the devil than believe in Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. Eighty-two expressed belief in a god. Seventy-two percent believed that Jesus is God or the Son of God. Belief in hell and the devil was expressed by 62 percent. Seventy-nine percent expressed belief in miracles.^{xii}

In *Zarathustra*, the description of inverse cripples passes into a description of society as "fragments and limbs of men," "ruins and scattered as over a battlefield or a butcher-field," "fragments and limbs and dreadful accidents — but no human beings." Nietzsche's politics are far from perfect, but he is correct that complete humans or what is described as human is not found in capitalism. What Nietzsche should have seen is that the "battlefield or butcher-field" was a humanity ravaged by the violence of imperialism, the exploitation of capitalism, the banality and stupidity of bourgeois society. It is a

humanity scarred by bourgeois society where even its great intellectual accomplishments are accompanied by deformity and monstrosity. Nietzsche echoes Karl Marx when he describes the contradictions within and imbalances of bourgeois society, the contradiction of great intelligence and disability, great accomplishment and great banality, existing at the same time, in the same individuals and societies. It is a characteristic of bourgeois society that it can only produce feats of intelligence at the expense of a greater crippling of itself.

Nietzsche's response to the catastrophe is confused, a mix of nihilism, irrationality, individualism, and traditionalism. Zarathustra places his hopes in a vaguely-described "overman" to surpass man. This is why Nietzsche could be appropriated and misappropriated by German fascism and eugenics. Fascism promised a rebirth of society, vitalism, heroism, but delivered only greater carnage and deformity, both physically, but, more importantly to Nietzsche, intellectually and culturally. Fascism resulted in a great brain drain in many fields, and only produced its own inverse cripples: advances in war technology, and little else. Martin Heidegger actively joined the Nazi movement, hoping for a way out of the spiritual void of modern society. By the end, he too recognized fascism as just another face of a system that promotes techne divorced from more meaningful ways of understanding the world. Following Heidegger, Herbert Marcuse saw both Western liberalism and Soviet society as two sides of the same coin. Despite claims to be very different from each other, both elevate "How to" knowledge over "Why?" knowledge. Knowledge about how to get from A to Z is emphasized without asking why should we be trying to get to Z. They both represent the rise of "instrumental reason" to the exclusion of other modes of thought.

The Soviet experiment was the first really sustained attempt at constructing socialism, attempting to reach communism. Soviet socialism was very influenced by the theory of the productive forces, a view that overemphasizes the role of technology in creating communism and underplays the role of revolutionizing power relations, culture and ideology, i.e. class struggle. It makes sense that if one sees the development of technology as the main force leading to communism, then one's cultural and educational policies will echo this outlook. Techne will be overemphasized to the exclusion of

broader knowledge. Divisions of knowledge and power will be consolidated that echo the liberal West, which has always seen technology as the key to creating prosperity, raising all boats, etc. It makes sense that Soviet society would come to measure itself by the goal posts of the liberal West. And, when Soviet leaders found socialism lacking, Soviet revisionists restored capitalism. Although the Maoist revolution made greater strides in understanding revisionism, capitalism was restored in China in similar ways.

Marx's answer to the catastrophe, "battlefield or a butcher-field," of capitalism is communist revolution. Capitalism produces its own grave digger: the proletariat. In capitalism, science, its methods and approaches, are originally the product of an intellectual world populated by *Zarathustra's* inverse cripples. However, it is when science is able to cross from the bourgeois intellectual world to the world of the dispossessed that revolution, overcoming the catastrophe of the modern world, surpassing current society, becomes possible. The great revolutionary leaders are not one-dimensional cripples. Great revolutionary leaders more approximate the ideal of communist multi-dimensional man. They have always had a foot in the world of high culture, the bourgeois-intellectual world, and a foot in the world of the masses. Marx was from a middle-class background, married a minor aristocrat's daughter, and earned a doctorate. Even so, he dedicated his life to proletarian activism and writing, which landed him in poverty. Marx had a foot in both worlds. Lenin too was from a somewhat privileged background such that he received a university degree. A life of serving the people, of revolutionary work, transformed Lenin into a proletarian intellectual and leader. Mao was from a peasant background, but privileged and well-off enough to be sent off to the city to receive an education. He was radicalized by his exposure to science and ideology from all over the world. Both Lenin and Mao had their feet in both worlds as thinkers and men of action. Revolutionary leaders, the Organization itself, is a bridge by which science, its methods, approaches, etc. cross into the hands of the people, but in this process the ideas are transformed by the revolutionary leadership into weapons that can be wielded by the masses. Genuine Leading Lights act as a kind of transformative bridge to the masses. And in that process, science becomes transformed, forged into a new weapon, into revolutionary science, into all-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light Communism. Just as

capitalism produces its own demise, so too does the culture of inverse cripples inadvertently aids in its own destruction. The proletarian struggle to end all oppression led by the most advanced revolutionary science ultimately destroys not only the physical brutality foisted upon society, but also the intellectual and cultural deformity. The inverse cripples of bourgeois society are replaced by proletarian intellectuals, people's warriors, heroes, Leading Lights. The Old Power is killed. A New Power is born. A new, vital, healthy culture is born. Leading Light succeeds where Nietzsche fails.

The revolutionary movement is at a critical juncture. After great defeats in the Soviet Union and China, the proletarian movement is struggling to survive. Leading Lights are just now piercing the darkness. A more advanced revolutionary science, all-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light Communism, is emerging. It is the transformative stage. It is moving from leadership to the masses. It is being forged into a mighty sword to place into the hands of the people. The seeds of New Power are just beginning to sprout. True heroes are emerging. At the same time, the effects of bourgeois culture ripple, even more strongly toward the revolutionary movement as our successes mount. Class struggle can intensify as the revolution gains ground. Victories can lead to increased attacks on the Organization by class enemies. In this instance, it manifests as Do Nothingism and Cowardly Lionism. These overlapping errors are often a result of inverse cripples infiltrating or posing as the revolutionary movement.

There are numerous revisionists who mine quotes from the Marxist tradition. They pontificate on all kinds of subjects. They debate on social media about the history of socialism or political economy as perceived through dogmatic lenses. In terms of practice, these "Marxist-Leninists" and "Maoists" are not that different from each other, or heaven forbid, the Trotskyists they so despise. Despite their over-the-top rhetoric, they do very little. At best, they do small forays into First Worldist, movementarian activism. Although they can quote monger the works of Marx, they still have not grasped "Philosophers have hitherto only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it."^{xiii} They can quote Lenin and Mao, but they have not grasped their meaning. They do not see what should be obvious: Revolution is about power. It is about seizing power, not merely

talking or fantasizing about it. The Peruvians use to promote the slogan “Without state power, all is illusion.” The whole orientation of the revolutionary movement must be toward seizing power. If it is not, then all words, all posturing, is just fantasy, illusory. The inverse-cripple revisionist thinks himself oh-so revolutionary, but really he has simply honed the skill of parodying past revolutionaries. Thinking themselves revolutionaries, even revolutionary intellectuals, they have gone to incredible lengths to master this strange talent. They have fine-tuned their art, becoming masters of dogma and cos play. Sometimes they might even appear to the less advanced more sincere and passionate about revolution than real revolutionaries. At the same time, they have developed no other talents. And, whatever potential they once may have had has long since withered away. So, they are nothing but big mouths wearing Mao hats on social media. A few people claim that with binoculars, one can see withered dangling bodies attached to the mouths. Others believe the mouths ate the bodies.

Deviations have always plagued the revolutionary movement. Revolutionary leaders are marked by their origins and the societies in which they exist. The Organization too is marked by its birth. Marx’s works are filled with polemics against the revisionists of his day. They are filled with analysis of the problems of the revolutionary movement. *The Communist Manifesto* ends with an analysis that traces revisionism and deviation back to its class origins. Lenin advanced this method further. One of the greatest works by Mao is *On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party*. In this work, Mao looks at the class origin of the mentalities that lead to deviations within the Organization. More than that, Mao proposes specific methods of rectification for each deviation. Part of the idea of criticism and self-criticism is to hammer out and destroy deviations using the collective wisdom of the Organization, to forge the cadre into a mighty weapon: people’s warriors, Leading Lights.

The inverse cripples and other effects of bourgeois decay will remain for the time being. The yappers will yap. The cowardly lions will roar. The jesters jest. Tumblr will reblog. Such is the air of capitalism. Lenin said that we have to be as radical as reality itself. We are scientists and warriors with revolutionary genius and heart. Organization. Leadership. Sacrifice. Duty. Courage. Honor. Respect. Loyalty. These

are not mere words, they are the code for winning power. Serve the people; serve the Earth. Live and die for the people and the Earth. We carry our lives on our finger tips. Long Live the all-powerful, awesome, glorious Leading Light! Our sun is rising. Our day is coming.

A Note on Conspiracy Theory and “Intelligent” Design

August 5, 2013

The popular idea that there is one over-arching plot to explain how society moves, the disasters that befall society, the rise and fall of regimes, etc. is inaccurate and counter-productive. Many conspiracy theories parallel the Christian outlook of so-called “intelligent design.” Christians often see the patterns in nature and conclude that such a natural order must be the work of a creator, a great architect or designer. In 1802, the theologian William Paley argued that because a watch contains order that is a result of a designer, a watchmaker, so too nature’s order must be the result of God. Christians, extrapolating on Aristotle, argued that animals and plants were perfectly fit to their environments and each other. Thus, they argued, there must be intelligence behind it all. As early as David Hume, writing in the mid-1700s, intelligent design was challenged. Hume argued that order in nature can be a result of simple processes. This can be seen in snowflake formation or crystal generation. This idea would be confirmed later in biology with the publication *On the Origin of Species* in 1859. Charles Darwin showed how order could arise in species from simple, natural processes over great periods of time, creating the illusion of intelligent design. The order found in the animal and plant kingdoms is a result of natural selection over millions of years.

Just as Christians see patterns in nature, conspiracy theorists see patterns in society and events. Both look for a non-existent single creator, a God or Illuminati, to explain the world or society. Such a view is inaccurate and unscientific. It is no accident that Karl Marx, the founder of revolutionary science, is said to have dedicated his major work, *Capital*, to Charles Darwin. Just as Darwin showed how evolution in nature results from wholly natural laws, so did Marx show how the order and evolution of society can be explained similarly, by material laws. Instead of looking for a master conspiracy or master plotter, revolutionary scientists examine the social forces and systems that produce such events. Even if an Illuminati, a master plotter, did exist, its members’ actions would still be largely determined over the long-term by their position in the power structure, by class, gender, national, etc. interests. In other words, even if there were an Illuminati, explanations that referred to individual plotters would be

largely superfluous to scientific explanation of society. In addition, such conspiracy-theory approaches are disempowering. They encourage the masses to look at revolution and social change through a police paradigm instead of a power paradigm. Even if one knew who the make-believe Illuminati were, it is not as though one could arrest and put them on trial. Instead, such theories mystify power and make the masses powerless victims of an all-powerful plot. By contrast, the power paradigm teaches the masses to apply revolutionary science, to unite the social forces necessary for revolution, to build New Power, to seize power, to create a new mode of production, to redesign all of society in order to reach Leading Light Communism, the end all systematic oppression.

On counter-revolution:
Just pointing to revisionists is not enough

June 15, 2014

Someone writes:

“Dear Leading Light,

LLCO has not responded convincingly to the causes behind the degeneration of the Chinese and Russian Revolutions. Just pointing to ‘revisionists’ is not enough (and analysis based on individual personality traits is hardly systemic or materialist). In any case, if revisionists can infiltrate into power with such apparent ease (escaping from the eyes of, Lenin, Stalin and Mao), then who could detect them and how?”

I agree 100 percent about your comments on the lack of adequate explanation of the failure of past socialism within the revisionist literature.

Leading Light has not provided a simple answer to this issue, although we have suggested some things in our various history articles. Our answers are far better than what others have said on the topic, especially Maoists. In general, I think that the models of socialism were primitive in many ways. I think that past socialism often had an oversimplified view of human need and what a good life is. Socialism was good at meeting survival needs. It was good at basic education, low-science ideological education, but it failed at meeting other needs. Humans need more than having their basic needs met and getting ideological education. They need to express themselves creatively — sometimes in ways that aren’t overtly political. They need fun. They need pleasure. “All struggle, all the time” is not sustainable. Past socialism was not able to compete with the West in this regard, which is why you got some of the youth fleeing socialism for the West. They want more out of life. I would like a socialism where the youth of the West flee to join us in our egalitarian, communal, vibrant, colorful, artistic, political, scientific, fun experiment. I am a big fan of people’s war. In fact, I think those who are unwilling to support people’s war

are revisionist. Those who talk about people's war but do not throw down or help are Do Nothingist and First Worldist yappers whatever they claim about themselves. Willingness to pick up the gun or help those who do are some marks of real communists. However, as much as I advocate a warrior spirit, I recognize the militant guerrilla ethos of socialism is a two-edge sword. The ethic of sacrifice, altruism, anti-consumerism is great, but people do not want to live like guerrilla fighters all the time. They need other metaphors by which to evaluate and identify themselves with. I led the charge to rehabilitate Lin Biao. Even so, I admit that we need more than simply "barracks egalitarianism," which is a term I have used to describe the Lin Biao trend, which was really the only Maoist trend with an articulate program for transforming the Cultural Revolution into something permanent. I was listening to interviews with ex-Maoist red guards. The same Maoist youth who were rising up in 1967 were, by 1976, coming out to support Zhou Enlai. They were disenchanted with constant Maoist calls for mobilization, especially with little results to show for them by the end. I got the sense there was a kind of collective burn out there.

Although political debate happened, it usually occurred at a very low-science level in those years. We need to be honest about this. What passes for Maoism is not high theory. It is mostly low science based on some very profound truths. Don't believe me? Read *Beijing Review* from the Cultural Revolution era. The standard method of argument is argument from authority. Mao said such and such. Lenin said this. Marx said that. This isn't true of every aspect of every polemic, but it is very pervasive. And if this is the debate China was projecting to the world in *Beijing Review*, imagine how low level the debate must have been on the streets. Science and intellectual debate was stifled in very unhealthy ways. For example, even mentioning that family planning might be good could get one labeled as a Malthusian because Mao once said a big population meant big strength. Similarly, Chinese environmentalists were suppressed with little debate. It is good to have debates at all levels, but it seems as though there was a big stifling of debate at the higher level. And yes, Maoism gave a voice to many who never had one. But I think it is too bad that this opening up of society had to come at such a high price. I think we can find a better way. Among other factors, this low level of discourse created a system that was weak and did over-rely on a very low-science loyalty to this or

that leader. This is why the fall of a single leader could result in such a seismic shift in the system.

There are many other issues. Although the Maoists broke in theory with past methods, in reality the break was not as great in practice. Yes there were mass mobilizations and the New Power that arose in the People's Liberation Army, but there was also a lot of police suppression, police method, police narrative and falsifications, lack of due process, brute force happening. At their best, the Maoists wanted a more structural and ideological analysis of counter-revolution, a more structural and ideological method of preventing it, in reality, they used the old methods probably as much as the new methods, often mixing them together. In practice, the Maoist break was not always as great as one would hope. I think there is a disconnect between how Maoist intellectuals frame the Cultural Revolution and the reality on the ground. This is also true of the rejection of the Theory of the Productive Forces and economism. In theory, the Maoists, at their best moments, rejected economism outright, but on the ground there was always a heavy economist trend and attempt to "catch up" with the imperialist West. This is also connected to First Worldism. This isn't to deny what is innovative in Maoism, the Maoist approach was very innovative at its best moments even if the real history is a mixed bag.

I see revolution as a big experiment. I see communism as a regulative ideal that we aim for. Our first really sustained experiment in the Soviet Union was defeated. But, we learn from that just as any scientist should learn from a past experiment. Our next laboratory for revolution, trying to reach that ideal of communism, was Maoist China. We learned some more things here. Cancer isn't going to be cured after two single experiments, well, neither will the cancer of exploitation and oppression be cured so easily. We are going up against thousands of years of entrenched structural inequality and social programming. The key is to keep advancing the experiment, to keep moving forward, toward that ideal of Leading Light Communism. Real science isn't discouraged by failure because there is something to learn even in failure. Science doesn't give up if it gets something wrong the first time. Fight, fight, and fight some more. Experiment, experiment, experiment some more. Learn, learn, learn. This is the correct attitude toward these issues. Lin Biao said revolution was a

train on two tracks, class struggle and development of the productive forces. The word has changed greatly. Imagine trying to run people's commune with a hundred thousand people with only pen and paper. Now, we have information technology, the green agricultural revolution, 3D printers. In addition, we know a lot more about class struggle now. Both the technology of the productive forces and technology of class struggle have advanced by leaps and bounds since then. I could say a lot more on this, but there are certain things that must remain secret for now. Deep politics must stay somewhat deep, underground. This is what Leading Light Communism is about: Not just talking about science, actually doing it. Innovation. Advancing the science. Taking it to the next level. Walking the walk.

What I say here is not some definitive answer. I mean to suggest lines of thought and investigation for the future, a kind of research project. What we must absolutely avoid is falling into dogma and stale formulations, Marxism-Leninism, Maoism, or whatever. Such dogma just doesn't have credibility. We have to really elevate the science. And create new forms of lower science also. Leading Light Communism is making the real breakthroughs.

It's still important to oppose book worship

June 6, 2011

Mao criticized and mocked those who had a metaphysical, dogmatic approach to books and knowledge:

“Whatever is written in a book is right — such is still the mentality of culturally backward Chinese peasants. Strangely enough, within the Communist Party there are also people who always say in a discussion, “Show me where it’s written in the book.””

Our’s is a very rich tradition. The most important revolutionary works are those of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Vladimir Lenin, Mao Zedong, Lin Biao, and the new Leading Light. Anyone who seriously claims to be a revolutionary must have some familiarity with these works. Because of the richness of this literature, it is easy to fall into book worship. There are those who act as though whether or not a claim is true depends on whether it can be found in the revolutionary classics. This kind of metaphysical attitude toward the classics should be opposed. Whether or not an assertion or theory is correct depends on how well that it predicts and explains the world. In other words, reality, not tradition, is the ultimate judge. This is an important, fundamental part of materialist epistemology.

We should avoid getting into wars over scripture. We should not quote monger. We should not fetishize the classics. Ultimately, it does not matter who can produce more quotes from the classics in support of their position. Those elements of the classics that help us predict and explain our world should be developed and expanded, incorporated into our science. If helpful, those passages should be referenced. We should not be afraid of rejecting the classics where they are wrong. Marxism is not religion. The classics should not be regarded as *the Holy Bible*. We are scientists, not monks.

Science evolves. Just as Albert Einstein built off of Isaac Newton, Lenin built off the works of Marx. Mao built off the works of Lenin. Leading Light Communism builds off this revolutionary history. Our work builds

off this tradition, incorporating and developing those elements that apply to the world, and leaving behind those elements that do not. We should not wrap ourselves in the orthodoxy as Maoists or Hoxhaists or Trotskyists do. Our authority is grounded in the truth of our science, not whether or not it reproduces an orthodoxy.

Leading Light Communism is the highest stage of Marxism, of revolutionary science. Today's Marxism develops and supersedes the Marxism of the past. The importance of the development of Leading Light Communism should not be understated. It is this banner that will be at the head of the next wave of revolution. The future is ours. This is what matters most.

Solving the Gordian Knot, instruction on method and decisiveness

March 1, 2014

According to legend, in the city of Telmissus, there was a massive knot looped again and again around the front of an oxcart. Rope over rope, the knot endlessly turned in on itself. It was said that the person who was able to untie the knot would conquer the world. Many pretenders had come before and been unable to solve the puzzle. Alexander examined the challenge that had defeated so many before. Looking at the knot, the student of Aristotle drew his sword and slashed away. The knot fell to the ground. Alexander went on to conquer.

We must be as Alexander: decisive, bold, creative. We must not fight battles on the enemy's terms. Do not let them set the rules. We play by our rules. Do the unexpected. In debate, direct your blows at the heart of an enemy's argument. Do not be distracted. Do not let your blows be deflected. Do not be baited with sophistry or lies. Our strength is we are armed with the most advanced revolutionary science, Leading Light Communism. Truth is on our side.

END NOTES

- ⁱ Anything You Can Do. <http://bitemarx.blogspot.kr/2011/10/anything-you-can-do.htm>
- ⁱⁱ <http://lco.org/on-falling-into-a-propeller-quotes-on-dialectics-and-science/>
- ⁱⁱⁱ <http://lco.org/on-falling-into-a-propeller-quotes-on-dialectics-and-science/>
- ^{iv} New American Standard Bible. Exodus 20:4. <http://biblehub.com/exodus/20-4.htm>
- ^v http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/07/01/isis-destroy-kaaba-mecca_n_5547635.html
- ^{vi} Sahih Al-Bukhari. Book 59, Hadith 584 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kaaba>
- ^{vii} Quran Sura 37: 91-95
<http://www.alim.org/library/quran/surah/english/37/MAL#sthash.UqLhDKdN.dpuf>
- ^{viii} http://jafariaschool.org/assets/notes/Class7_Tarikh.pdf
- ^{ix} Marx, Karl. Theses On Feuerbach.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm>
- ^x *ibid.*
- ^{xi} Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. The Portable Nietzsche edited by Kaufmann, Walter. Penguin Books. (USA: 1968) p. 250
- ^{xii} <http://uk.reuters.com/article/2007/11/29/us-usa-religion-beliefs-idUKN2922875820071129>
- ^{xiii} Marx, Karl. "Theses On Feuerbach." 1845
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/>